arXiv:math/0211467v1 [math.NT] 3 Nov 2002

Contents

1 Some definitions **13**

2 On structure of p-subgroup of the class group of $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$ **15**
  2.1 Some definitions and notations 15
  2.2 Representations $\rho_d : G_d \to \mathbf{GL}(\mathbf{F}_p.V_d)$. 15
  2.3 Representations of Galois group $Gal(\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)/\mathbb{Q})$ in characteristic p. 18
    2.3.1 Some preliminary results 18
    2.3.2 Preliminary on representations 21
  2.4 On the structure of the p-class group of subfields of $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$ 22
    2.4.1 Some definitions and notations 22
    2.4.2 On the irregularity index 23
    2.4.3 Inequalities involving degrees r_1, r_d, r_g of minimal polynomials $P_{r_1}(V), P_{r_d}(V), P_{r_g}(V)$ annihilating ideal $\mathbf{b}$. 24
    2.4.4 On Stickelberger's ideal in field $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$ 25
    2.4.5 π-adic congruences connected to p-relative class group C_p^- 26
    2.4.6 The case $\mu = u_{2m+1}, \quad 2m+1 > \frac{p-1}{2}$ 36
    2.4.7 On the prime factors of the class number h of $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$. 39
    2.4.8 An explicit formula for the relative class number h^- of $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$ 41

3 On structure of the unit group $F = \mathbb{Z}[\zeta+\zeta^{-1}]^*/(\mathbb{Z}[\zeta+\zeta^{-1}]^*)^p$ **43**
  3.1 On structure of unit group $F = \mathbb{Z}[\zeta+\zeta^{-1}]^*/(\mathbb{Z}[\zeta+\zeta^{-1}]^*)^p$ 43
  3.2 The case $\mu = u_{2m}, \quad 2m > \frac{p-1}{2}$ 47
  3.3 Connection with set of units E_{2i} of Washington 47
  3.4 On structure of Singular Group 48

4 On Hilbert class field of $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$ **51**
  4.1 Some definitions and properties of Hilbert class field of $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$ 51
    4.1.1 Definitions and preliminary results 51
    4.1.2 Some results on structure of p-Hilbert class field of $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$ 54
    4.1.3 On Galois group of extension $H/\mathbb{Q}$ 57
  4.2 Congruences $\bmod \pi$ in p-elementary Hilbert class field H 58

5 On Hilbert class field of $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta+\zeta^{-1})$ **60**
  5.1 Some definitions 60
  5.2 Relations between Hilbert class fields H and H^+ 61
  5.3 Artin map for Hilbert class fields H and H^+ 64

6 Connection between roots mod p of Mirimanoff polynomials and p-class group of $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$ 68

7 Some preliminaries on FLT 72
7.1 Some definitions on FLT 72
7.2 Preliminary results 73
    7.2.1 Elementary congruences mod p in $\mathbb{Z}[\zeta]$ 73
    7.2.2 An upper bound estimate of the class number of the cyclotomic field 74

8 FLT first case: Some congruences mod p 76
8.1 Principle of the method 76
8.2 Definitions and notations 80
8.3 Some general congruences mod π^ν in $\mathbb{Z}[\zeta]$. 81
8.4 Congruences mod p connected to sums $\sum_{i=1}^{f} \frac{g_i l_i}{(x+\zeta^{g_i}y)}$. 83
8.5 Eichler's theorem 87

9 FLT first case : Some congruences on Mirimanoff polynomials 89
9.1 The foundation Theorem 89
9.2 Definitions connected with sets I_f 94
9.3 Definitions connected with sets U_f. 95
9.4 Connection between sum and product congruences mod π^{p-1} of sets U_f . . 96
9.5 A canonical form of congruences mod p for FLT first case-I 98
9.6 A comparison with Mirimanoff, Herbrand and Ribet/Kolyvagin 101
9.7 A canonical form of congruences mod p for FLT first case-II 103
9.8 A comparison with Mirimanoff 107
9.9 A connection between Mirimanoff congruences and $p-$rank of the class group of $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)/\mathbb{Q}$ 108

10 FLT first case: Mirimanoff in intermediate fields K with $\mathbb{Q} \subset K \subset \mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$. Part I. 110
10.1 Some definitions 110
10.2 Results on Mirimanoff in intermediate fields K, $\mathbb{Q} \subset K \subset \mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$ 111
    10.2.1 Definitions connected with sets U_{f_g}. 111
    10.2.2 Instanciation of σ-theorem to σ^g-theorems 112

11 FLT First case: Mirimanoff in intermediate fields K with $\mathbb{Q} \subset K \subset \mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$. Part II 116
11.1 First case of FLT and Gauss periods 116

11.2 FLT results in intermediate fields $\mathbb{Q} \subset K \subset \mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$. 120
11.3 Fermat equation in quadratic subfield of $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)/\mathbb{Q}$. 121

12 FLT first case: Elementary congruences on $t \equiv -\frac{x}{y}$ mod p. 123
12.1 A First elementary approach 123
12.2 A second elementary approach 126
12.3 A partial proof of FLT first case with symmetric sums of Mirimanoff polynomials 130
12.4 Some elementary congruences derived of Mirimanoff's congruences- II . . . 135
12.5 Numerical MAPLE applications and a conjecture implying first case of FLT 136

13 FLT first case: Representations of $Gal(\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)/\mathbb{Q})$ approach 140
13.1 Connection between Mirimanoff's polynomials and representations 141
13.2 On rank r of Fermat congruences mod p 143
13.3 On Eichler's Theorem in intermediate fields 145

14 FLT first case: Representations and congruences $\phi_m(t) \equiv 0$ mod p. 146
14.1 General properties of congruences $\phi_m(t) \equiv 0$ mod p. 146
14.2 The theorems on $\phi_m(t)$ mod p, $, m = 1, \dots, p-1$ 148
14.3 The representation approach for Fermat-Wiles 149
  14.3.1 A summary on the different p-groups of the Fermat's equation . . . 149
  14.3.2 Some results on Representations approach 152
  14.3.3 A summary on the ranks and minimal polynomials 153
  14.3.4 On singular integers and minimal polynomial $P_{r_s}(V)$. 155
  14.3.5 Congruences on Mirimanoff polynomials 157

15 FLT first case: Hilbert's class field of $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$ approach 158
15.1 Application of Hilbert's class field to FLT 158
15.2 Some congruences on unit ε of Fermat's equation in p-Hilbert class field H. 159
  15.2.1 A representation approach 159
  15.2.2 An application of Dirichlet's units theorem in $H/\mathbb{Q}$ 161

16 FLT first case: An improvement of Kummer's result on Jacobi resolvents 163
16.1 Some definitions 163
16.2 Elementary properties of sets $I(d)$ 164
16.3 Some Kummer's principal ideals 167
16.4 On p-rank of the matrix of Kummer's system 168
16.5 Generalizations of Kummer congruences - I 170

16.6 Bernoulli Numbers and sums $\sum_{j\in\cup_{l=1}^{d}[\frac{lp}{d+1},\frac{lp}{d}[}\frac{1}{j^{2m+1}}$ 176
16.7 Generalizations of Kummer congruences - II 180
16.8 Generalization to exponential congruences $f(p,t)\equiv 0 \bmod p$. 182

17 FLT first case: A comparative survey with bibliography 183

18 FLT first case: A generalization to diophantine equations $\frac{x^p+y^p}{x+y}=t_1^p$ and $x^p+y^p+c\times z^p=0$ 193
18.1 Introduction 193
18.2 Some results 194

19 FLT second case : miscelleanous 197
19.1 An elementary approach 197
19.2 Cyclotomic number fields approach 199
19.3 Hilbert class field and representations approach 202

Abstract

Roland Quême
13 avenue du château d'eau
31490 Brax
France
2002 october 31
mailto: roland.queme@free.fr
home page: http://roland.queme.free.fr/index.html

****

- This monograph extends two previous works entitled:
  - *A generalization of Eichler's criterion for Fermat's Last Theorem*
  - *A classical approach on Fermat-Wiles theorem*
- This monograph contains a first part on **cyclotomic fields** dealing with class group, unit group and Hilbert class field of cyclotomic fields, independantly of Fermat-Wiles Theorem.

  Class group of cyclotomic field $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$

  - This topic is studied in sections 2 p. 15. Let $p \in \mathbb{N}, \quad p > 5$ be a prime. Let ζ be a root of the equation $X^{p-1} + X^{p-2} + \cdots + X + 1 = 0$. Let $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$ be the p-cyclotomic field and $\mathbb{Z}[\zeta]$ be the ring of integers of $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$. Let C_p, C_p^+, C_p^- be respectively the p-class group of $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$, the p-class group of $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta + \zeta^{-1})$ and the relative p-class group $C_p^- = C_p/C_p^+$. Let $C_p^1 \subset C_p$ be the subgroup of the p-class group of $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$ whose elements are of order 1 or p. Let r_p be the rank of C_p^1. Let us note $C_p^1 = \oplus_{i=1}^{r_p} \Gamma_i$, where Γ_i is a cyclic group of order p. Let $u \in \mathbb{N}$ be a primitive root $\mod p$. Let $\sigma : \zeta \rightarrow \zeta^u$ be a $\mathbb{Q}$-isomorphism of $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$. We know that σ generates $G = Gal(\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)/\mathbb{Q})$. Let $\mathbf{b}_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, r_p$, be a not principal ideal of $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$ whose class belongs to group Γ_i. Observe at first that $\sigma(\mathbf{b}_i) \simeq \mathbf{b}_i^{\mu_i}$ where $\simeq$ is notation for class equivalence and $\mu_i \in \mathbf{F}_p^*$ and where $\mathbf{F}_p^*$ is the set of no null elements of the finite field of cardinal p. Let the ideal $\mathbf{b} = \prod_{i=1}^{r_p} \mathbf{b}_i$. Let $d \in \mathbb{N}, \quad p-1 \equiv 0 \bmod d$. Let us define the minimal polynomial $P_{r_d}(U)$ of degree r_d in the indeterminate U such that $P_{r_d}(\sigma^d)$ annihilates the ideal class of $\mathbf{b}$ written also $\mathbf{b}^{P_{r_d}(\sigma^d)} \simeq \mathbb{Z}[\zeta]$. We show that the polynomial $P_{r_d}(U)$ verifies a relation of form $P_{r_d}(U) = \prod_{i=1}^{r_d}(U - \mu_i^d), \quad \mu_i \in \mathbf{F}_p^*$, and then we obtain the following results:
    1. For $d = 1$ then r_1 is the index of irregularity of $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$ (the number of even Bernoulli Numbers $B_{p-1-2m} \equiv 0 \bmod p$ for $1 \leq m \leq \frac{p-3}{2}$).
    2. For $Gcd(d_1, d_2) = 1$ then $r_{d_1} \times r_{d_2} \geq r_1$.
    3. Let the ideal $\pi = (\zeta - 1)\mathbb{Z}[\zeta]$. There exists $B_i \in \mathbb{Z}[\zeta], \quad i = 1, \dots, r_p$, with $B_i\mathbb{Z}[\zeta] = \mathbf{b}_i^{n_i p}, \quad n_i \in \mathbf{F}_p^*, \quad \pi | (B_i - 1)$ and with $\sigma(B_i) = B_i^{\mu_i} \times \alpha_i^p, \quad \alpha_i \in \mathbb{Q}(\zeta), \quad \mu_i \in \mathbf{F}_p^*$. For $\mu_i = u^{m_i}, \quad m_i \in \mathbb{N}, \quad 1 \leq m_i \leq p-2$, then $\pi^{m_i} | B_i - 1$.
    4. Let r_p^+ be the rank of the p-class group of $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta + \zeta^{-1})$. We can precise the previous result: with a certain reordering of indexing of $B_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, r_p$,
       - For $i = 1, \dots, r_p^+$ then the B_i are singular primary, so $\pi^p | (B_i - 1)$,
       - for $i = r_p^+ + 1, \dots, r_p$ then $\pi^{m_i} \| (B_i - 1)$.

5. $\mu_i = u^{2m_i+1}$ with $1 \leq m_i \leq \frac{p-3}{2}$ corresponds to an ideal $\mathbf{b}_i$ whose class belongs to C_p^-, relative p-class group of $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$. In that case define $C_i = \frac{B_i}{\overline{B_i}}$, so with $C_i \in \mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$. If $2m_i + 1 > \frac{p-1}{2}$ then it is possible to prove the explicit very simple formula for C_i:

$$C_i \equiv 1 - \frac{\gamma_i}{1-\mu_i} \times (\zeta + \mu_i^{-1}\zeta^u + \cdots + \mu_i^{-(p-2)}\zeta^{u^{p-2}}) \bmod \pi^{p-1}, \quad \gamma_i \in \mathbf{F}_p.$$

unit group $F = \mathbb{Z}[\zeta + \zeta^{-1}]^*/(\mathbb{Z}[\zeta + \zeta^{-1}]^*)^p$.

- This topic is studied in section 3 p. 43. We apply in following results to unit group $\mathbb{Z}[\zeta + \zeta^{-1}]^*$ the method applied to p-class group in previous results:
  1. There exists a fundamental system of units $\eta_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, \frac{p-3}{2}$, of the group $F = \mathbb{Z}[\zeta + \zeta^{-1}]^*/(\mathbb{Z}[\zeta + \zeta^{-1}]^*)^p$ verifying the relations:

     (1)

     $$\begin{aligned}
     &\eta_i \in \mathbb{Z}[\zeta + \zeta^{-1}]^*, \quad i = 1, \dots, \frac{p-3}{2},\\
     &\sigma(\eta_i) = \eta_i^{\mu_i} \times \varepsilon_i^p, \quad \mu_i \in \mathbf{F}_p^*, \quad \varepsilon_i \in \mathbb{Z}[\zeta + \zeta^{-1}]^*, \quad i = 1, \dots, \frac{p-3}{2},\\
     &\eta_i \equiv 1 \bmod \pi^{2m_i}, \quad \mu_i = u^{2m_i}, \quad i = 1, \dots, \frac{p-3}{2},\\
     &\sigma(\eta_i) \equiv \eta_i^{\mu_i} \bmod \pi^{p+1}, \quad i = 1, \dots, \frac{p-3}{2}.
     \end{aligned}$$

  2. With a certain reordering of indexing of $i = 1, \dots, \frac{p-3}{2}$, then
     - $*$ for $i = 1, \dots, r_p$, then η_i are primary, so $\pi^p | (\eta_i - 1)$,
     - $*$ for $i = r_p + 1, \dots, \frac{p-3}{2}$, then $\pi^{2m_i} \| (\eta_i - 1)$.
  3. If $2m_i > \frac{p-1}{2}$ then it is possible to prove the very simple explicit formula for η_i:

     $$\eta_i \equiv 1 - \frac{\gamma_i}{1-\mu_i} \times (\zeta + \mu_i^{-1}\zeta^u + \cdots + \mu_i^{-(p-2)}\zeta^{u^{p-2}}) \bmod \pi^{p-1}, \quad \gamma_i \in \mathbf{F}_p.$$

p-elementary Hilbert class field of $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$.

- Section 4 p. 51 deals of Hilbert class field : we recall some results on Hilbert class field and on Furtwangler and Hecke Theorem of interest in study of Fermat's equation. In section 5 p. 60 we study some relations between Hilbert class field of $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$ and of subfield $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta + \zeta^{-1})$.
- We call p-elementary Hilbert class field H of $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$ the subfield of the Hilbert class field of $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$ verifying by Artin map $Gal(H/\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)) \cong C_p^1$, where the group C_p^1 has been defined above. The following result is representative of our results on Hilbert class field:

  - With a certain reordering of index $i = 1, \dots, r_p$, and with the same meaning of $B_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, r_p$, than in previous results, the p-elementary Hilbert class field verifies the structure:

    $$H = \mathbb{Q}(\zeta, \omega_1, \dots, \omega_{r_p}), \quad \omega_i^p \in \mathbb{Q}(\zeta), \quad \omega_i \notin \mathbb{Q}(\zeta), \quad i = 1, \dots, r_p,$$

    - ∗ where, for $i = 1, \dots, r_p$, the ω_i^p are primary,
    - ∗ where, for $i = 1, \dots, r_p^+$,

      $$\omega_i^p = B_i, \quad B_i \in \mathbb{Z}[\zeta], \quad B_i\mathbb{Z}[\zeta] = \mathbf{b}_i^p, \quad Cl(\mathbf{b}_i) \in C_p^-,$$
      $$B_i\overline{B}_i = \beta_i^p, \quad \beta_i \in \mathbb{Z}[\zeta + \zeta^{-1}] - \mathbb{Z}[\zeta + \zeta^{-1}]^*,$$

    - ∗ where, for $i = r_p^+ + 1, \dots, r_p$, the $\omega_i^p \in \mathbb{Z}[\zeta + \zeta^{-1}]^*$.

  Connection of Mirimanoff polynomials with p-class group of $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$.

  Recall that, for $m \in \mathbb{N}, \quad 1 \leq m \leq \frac{p-3}{2}$, the polynomials $\phi_{2m+1}(T) = \sum_{i=1}^{p-1} i^{2m} \times T^i$ are the odd Mirimanoff polynomials of the indeterminate T. Suppose that p divides the class number h of $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$. Let $r_p^- > 0$ be the relative p-class group C_p^-. We have proved that, for $i = 1, \dots, r_p^-$, there exist different natural integers $m_i \in \mathbb{N}, \quad 1 \leq m_i \leq \frac{p-3}{2}$, and ideals $\mathbf{b}_i$ of $\mathbb{Z}[\zeta], \quad Cl(\mathbf{b}_i) \in C_p^-, \quad \sigma(\mathbf{b}_i) \simeq \mathbf{b}_i^{\mu_i}, \quad \mu_i = u^{2m_i+1}$, and natural integers $b_i, \quad 1 < b_i \leq p-1$, verifying Mirimanoff polynomial congruences following

  $$\phi_{2m_i+1}(b_i) \times \phi_{p-2m_i-1}(b_i) \equiv 0 \bmod p, \quad i = 1, \dots, r_p^-.$$

- This monograph contains a second part dealing with **Fermat-Wiles** theorem on a classical approach. The Wiles's proof of Fermat's Last Theorem lets open the question to know if there exists also a proof of first case of Fermat's Last Theorem resting on Classical Algebraic Number Theory. In this context, this monograph deals with several researchs on Fermat's equation lying on:
  - some elementary properties of the ring of integers of the p-cyclotomic number field $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$,
  - on the representations of the Galois group G of $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$ over the finite field $\mathbf{F}_p$, with the p-class group of $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$ seen as a $\mathbf{F}_p[G]$ module,
  - on the Hilbert class field of $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$.

  In this second part:

  - Let $p > 5$ be a prime. Let ζ be a primitive p-root of unity. Let $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$ be the p-cyclotomic number field. Let h be the class number of $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$. Let $e_p \in \mathbb{N}$ defined by $h = p^{e_p} \times h_2, \quad h_2 \in \mathbb{N}, \quad h_2 \not\equiv 0 \bmod p$. Let r_p be the p-rank of the class group of $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$. Let $x, y, z \in \mathbb{Z} - \{0\}$ be mutually co-prime. Let us assume that x, y, z verify the Fermat's equation $x^p+y^p+z^p=0$ with $xyz \not\equiv 0 \bmod p$ (first case). Let $t \in \mathbb{Z}$, $\quad t \equiv -\frac{x}{y} \bmod p$. Let $\phi_{2m+1}(T) = T + 2^{2m} \times T^2 + \cdots + (p-1)^{2m} \times T^{p-1}$, $\quad m = 1, \dots, \frac{p-3}{2}$, be the odd Mirimanoff polynomials of the indeterminate T. In section 9 p. 89, we give an **elementary** proof that, if $r_p < \frac{p-1}{2}$, then

$$Card\{m \quad | \quad 1 \leq m \leq \frac{p-3}{2}, \quad \phi_{2m+1}(t) \equiv 0 \bmod p\} \geq \frac{p-3}{2} - r_p.$$

- In sections 10 p. 110 and 11 p. 116, we study Mirimanoff's congruences in intermediate fields between $\mathbb{Q}$ and $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$ and obtain strong generalizations on Mirimanoff polynomials. As an example, let $p-1 = f \times g$ with f odd. Let K be the intermediate field $\mathbb{Q} \subset K \subset \mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$ and $[K:\mathbb{Q}] = g$. Suppose that p does not divide the class number of $K/\mathbb{Q}$. Then we have the Mirimanoff's polynomials congruences $\bmod p$

  $$\phi_{f(2n+1)}(t) \equiv 0 \bmod p, \quad n = 0, 1, \dots, \frac{g-2}{2}.$$

- Section 12 p. 123 deals, in a strictly elementary appoach, of a set of explicit polynomials congruences $P(t) \equiv 0 \bmod p$, $\quad P(T) \in \mathbf{F}_p[T]$, $\quad t \equiv -\frac{x}{y}$; we explain why it is legitimous to conjecture that all these congruences are not simultaneously possible. As an example, we prove the particular case of Fermat (first and second case): $p \| (x-y) \times (y-z) \times (z-x)$ implies that $x^p + y^p + z^p \neq 0$.
- Section 14 p. 146 generalizes to polynomial congruences $\phi_m(t) \equiv 0 \bmod p$, $\quad 1 \leq m \leq p-1$, some results obtained in previous sections for congruences $\phi_{2m+1}(t) \equiv 0 \bmod p$, $\quad 1 \leq m \leq \frac{p-3}{2}$.
- In section 16 p. 163, we give new *summation criteria* depending only on p for the first case of FLT with an extension of methods of nineteenth century resting on Kummer's result on Jacobi resolvents and on Stickelberger theorem.
  - the first known example seen in the litterature being the Cauchy criterion : if $\sum_{j=1}^{(p-1)/2} \frac{1}{j^3} \not\equiv 0 \bmod p$, then the first case of FLT holds for p). Different other summation criteria seen in the literature are Vandiver, Schwindt, Yamada, Ribenboim, Skula, Ciranek, Dilcher-Skula and others.
  - In this monograph, we give several new summation criteria. As an example of results obtained, we give the $(p-2)(p-3)$ new summation criteria: for each $d_1, d_2 \in \mathbb{N}$, $\quad 1 \leq d_1 < d_2 \leq p-2$, if $\sum_{l=1}^{d_1} \sum_{m=1}^{d_2} \sum_{j \in [\frac{lp}{d_1+1}, \frac{lp}{d_1}] \cap [\frac{mp}{d_2+1}, \frac{mp}{d_2}]} \frac{1}{j^3} \not\equiv 0 \bmod p$, then the first case of FLT holds for p.

  - In section 19 p. 197 dedicated to second case, we prove, as an example, the second case of FLT when $p \parallel y$, with a strictly elementary method in $\mathbb{Z}$ resting on Barlow-Abel formulas proved in first part on nineteenth century. We give also *canonical* forms of the Fermat's equation resting on classical theory of $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$ when the class number h^+ of the field $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta+\zeta^{-1})$ is divisible or not divisible by p.
  - In this monograph, it is also important to note, as explained in section 18 p. 193, that almost our results on the First case of FLT can be applied to a wider set of diophantine equations than the Fermat equation, in fact for a prime $p \in \mathbb{N}, \quad p > 5$,
    - ∗ all the equations of the form:

      $$(2) \qquad \frac{x^p + y^p}{x + y} = t_1^p, \quad x, y, t_1 \in \mathbb{Z}, \quad xy(x^2 - y^2) \not\equiv 0 \bmod p.$$

      Observe that $xy(x^2 - y^2) \not\equiv 0 \bmod p$ is hypothesis of Terjanian conjecture for equation (2) to have only a trivial Kummer's system of congruences.
    - ∗ All the equations of the form:

      $$(3) \quad x^p + y^p + c \times z^p = 0, \quad x, y, z, c \in \mathbb{Z}, \quad xy(x^2 - y^2) \not\equiv 0 \bmod p,$$

      where all the prime factors q of c verify $q \not\equiv 1 \bmod p$, belong to this category.
  - For a first quick outlook of first case of Fermat-Wiles Theorem , see at first the **Table Of Content** of this monograph and the **Comparative survey with First Case bibliography** section 17 on page 183, where we compare some of our results with bibliography, with, for each result, the ident number and page number of the theorem.
- The important results (subjective) are tagged with the symbol ***. Our main interrogation is to know those of them that Professionnal Number Theorists feel correct and, among them, those that they feel not known in literature.
- The *Table of Content* completes this abstract to see more precisely the methods and perimeter of our study of cyclotomic fields and of Fermat-Wiles theorem.
- **dependances between sections and reading order**:
  - sequence: $1 \rightarrow 2 \rightarrow 3 \rightarrow 4 \rightarrow 5 \rightarrow 6$, cyclotomic fields
  - sequence: $1 \rightarrow 7 \rightarrow 8 \rightarrow 9 \rightarrow 10 \rightarrow 11$, FLT
  - sequence: $1 \rightarrow 7 \rightarrow 8 \rightarrow 12$, FLT
  - sequence: $1 \rightarrow 2 \rightarrow 3 \rightarrow 7 \rightarrow 8 \rightarrow 13 \rightarrow 14$, FLT

- sequence: $1 \to 2 \to 3 \to 4 \to 15$, FLT
- sequence: $1 \to 7 \to 8 \to 16$, FLT

A classical approach on cyclotomic fields and Fermat-Wiles theorem - Version 1.2

Roland Quême

2002 october 31

PART ONE: ON CYCLOTOMIC FIELDS

This first part of the monograph deals of cyclotomic field $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta_p)$ for p prime, without any connection with Fermat-Wiles Theorem. It contains:

- A study of the structure of the p-class group of the field $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$.
- A study of the structure of the unit group $\mathbb{Z}[\zeta+\zeta^{-1}]^*$.
- A study of the structure of the Hilbert class field of $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$.
- A study of the structure of the Hilbert class field of $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta+\zeta^{-1})$.

1 Some definitions

In this section, we fix notations used in all this monograph.

- For $a \in \mathbb{R}^+$, we note $[a]$ the integer part of a or the integer immediately below a.
- We denote $[a, b], \quad a, b \in \mathbb{R}$, the closed interval bounded by a, b.
- Let us denote $< a >$ the cyclic group generated by the element a.
- Let $p \in \mathbb{N}, \quad p > 5$, be a prime.
- Let $u \in \mathbb{N}$ be a primitive root $\mod p$.
- For $i \in \mathbb{N}$, let us denote $u_i \equiv u^i \mod p, \quad 1 \leq u_i \leq p-1$. For $i \in \mathbb{Z}, \quad i < 0$, this is to be understood as $u_i u^{-i} \equiv 1 \mod p$. This notation follows the convention adopted in Ribenboim [39], last paragraph of page 118. This notation is largely used in the sequel of this monograph.
- Let $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$ be the p-cyclotomic number field.
- Let $\mathbb{Z}[\zeta]$ be the ring of integers of $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$.
- Let $\mathbb{Z}[\zeta]^*$ be the group of units of $\mathbb{Z}[\zeta]$.
- Let $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta+\zeta^{-1})$ be the maximal real subfield of $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$, with $[\mathbb{Q}(\zeta) : \mathbb{Q}(\zeta+\zeta^{-1})] = 2$. The ring of integers of $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta+\zeta^{-1})$ is $\mathbb{Z}[\zeta+\zeta^{-1}]$. Let $\mathbb{Z}[\zeta+\zeta^{-1}]^*$ be the group of units of $\mathbb{Z}[\zeta+\zeta^{-1}]$.
- Let $\mathbf{F}_p$ be the finite field with p elements. Let $\mathbf{F}_p^* = \mathbf{F}_p - \{0\}$.
- Let us denote $\mathbf{a}$ the integral ideals of $\mathbb{Z}[\zeta]$. Let us note $\mathbf{a} \simeq \mathbf{b}$ when the two ideals $\mathbf{a}$ and $\mathbf{b}$ are in the same class of the class group of $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$. $\mathbf{a} \simeq \mathbb{Z}[\zeta]$ means that the ideal $\mathbf{a}$ is principal.
- Let us note $Cl(\mathbf{a})$ the class of the ideal $\mathbf{a}$ in the class group of $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$. $< Cl(\mathbf{a}) >$ is the finite group generated by the class $Cl(\mathbf{a})$.
- If $a \in \mathbb{Z}[\zeta]$, we note $a\mathbb{Z}[\zeta]$ a principal integral ideal of $\mathbb{Z}[\zeta]$.
- We have $p\mathbb{Z}[\zeta] = \pi^{p-1}$ where π is the principal prime ideal $(1-\zeta)\mathbb{Z}[\zeta]$.
- Let us denote $\lambda = \zeta - 1$.
- Let us denote $\tau : \mathbb{Q}(\zeta) :\rightarrow \mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$, the $\mathbb{Q}$-isomorphism of $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$ defined by $\tau(\zeta) = \zeta^{-1}$, (complex conjugation). For $a \in \mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$, we note also $\overline{a} = \tau(a)$.

- For $i = 1, \dots, p-1$, let us denote $\tau_i : \mathbb{Q}(\zeta) \rightarrow \mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$, the $\mathbb{Q}$-isomorphism of $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$ defined by $\tau_i(\zeta) = \zeta^i$.
- Let $G = Gal(\mathbb{Q}(\zeta/\mathbb{Q})$ be the Galois group of the field $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$.
- Let $\sigma : \mathbb{Q}(\zeta) \rightarrow \mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$ be the $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$-isomorphism defined by $\sigma(\zeta) = \zeta^u$ where u is a primitive root $\mod p$. The $\mathbb{Q}$-isomorphism σ generates the Galois group $G = Gal(\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)/\mathbb{Q})$.
- For $d \in \mathbb{N}, \quad p - 1 \equiv 0 \bmod d$, let G_d be the cyclic subgroup of G generated by σ^d, so with $G_1 = G$.
- Let C_p be the p-class group of the field $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$, the subgroup of the class group whose elements are of p-power order.
- Let C_p^+ be the p-class group of the field $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta + \zeta^{-1})$.
- Let C_p^- be the relative class group defined by $C_p^- = C_p/C_p^+$.
- Let h be the class number of $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$. The class number h verifies the formula $h = h^- \times h^+$, where h^+ is the class number of the maximal real field $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta+\zeta^{-1})$, so called also second factor, and h^- is the relative class number, so called first factor.
- Let us define e_p by $h = p^{e_p} \times h_2, \quad h_2 \not\equiv 0 \bmod p$. Let us define e_p^- by $h^- = p^{e_p^-} \times h_2^-, \quad h_2^- \not\equiv 0 \bmod p$.
- Let r_p, r_p^+, r_p^-, be respectively the p-rank of the class group of $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$, of the class group of $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta + \zeta^{-1})$ and of the relative class group.
- The abelian group C_p of order p^{e_p} is $C_p = \oplus_{i=1}^{r_p} C_i$ where $C_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, r_p$, are cyclic groups of order p^{e_i} with $e_p = e_1 + \cdots + e_{r_p}$. Let C_p^1 be the subgroup of C_p whose elements are of order 1 or p. The group C_p^1 is a group of order p^{r_p} with $C_p^1 = \oplus_{i=1}^{r_p} C_i'$ where C_i' are cyclic group of order p. The group C_p^1 plays a central role in this FLT study.
- Let C_p^{1+} be the subgroup of C_p^+ whose elements are of order 1 or p.
- Let C_p^{1-} be the subgroup of C_p^- whose elements are of order 1 or p.
- Let us note $\phi_m(T) = \sum_{i=1}^{p-1} i^{m-1} \times T^i$ the Mirimanoff polynomials of the indeterminate T.

2 On structure of p-subgroup of the class group of $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$

The three first subsections 2.1 p.15, 2.2 p. 15 and 2.3 p.18 give some definitions and general properties of the p-class group of the extension $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)/\mathbb{Q}$. The subsection 2.4 p. 22 gives some results obtained in the structure of the p-class group C_p of $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$ and on class number h of $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$.

2.1 Some definitions and notations

In this subsection, we fix or recall some notations used in all this section.

2.2 Representations $\rho_d : G_d \rightarrow \mathbf{GL}(\mathbf{F}_p.V_d)$.

- Let $c_i = Cl(\sigma^i(\mathbf{b})), \quad i = 0, \dots, p-2$, be the class of $\sigma^i(\mathbf{b})$ in the p-class group of $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$.
- With these notations, we have $c_{id} = Cl(\sigma^{id}(\mathbf{b})), \quad i = 0, \dots, \frac{p-1}{d} - 1$.
- The groups $< c_{id} >, \quad i = 0, \dots, \frac{p-1}{d} - 1$, are cyclic groups of order p.
- Let, for d given, $C_{p,d}$ be the subgroup of C_p^1 generated by the set of ideal classes

  $$E_d = \{c_{id} \quad | \quad i = 0, \dots, \frac{p-1}{d} - 1\}.$$

  Let, for d given, r_d be the p-rank of $C_{p,d}$. Clearly, from these definitions, it results immediatly that

  $$1 \leq r_d \leq \frac{p-1}{d}. \tag{4}$$

  Show that the group $C_{p,d}$ is also generated by the set of classes of ideals

  $$E_d(r_d) = \{c_{id} \quad | \quad i = 0, \dots, r_d - 1\} : \tag{5}$$

  - It is clear when $r_d = \frac{p-1}{d}$.
  - Suppose that $r_d < \frac{p-1}{d}$ and that the group $C(E_d(r_d))$ generated by the set of classes $E_d(r_d)$ verifies $C(E_d(r_d)) \subset C_{p,d}$ and $C(E_d(r_d)) \neq C_{p,d}$ and search for a contradiction:

- $*$ Suppose at first that $c_{id}, \quad i=0,\dots,r_d$, are not linearly independant: from linear relation between the $c_{id}, \quad i=0,\dots,r_d$, by conjugation σ^d, we would get the same relation between $c_{id}, \quad i=1,\dots,r_d+1$ and then, by elimination, a linear relation between $c_{id}, \quad i=0,\dots,r_d-1$ and $c_{(r_d+1)d}$, and in the same way, between $c_{id}, \quad i=0,\dots,r_d-1$ and $c_{(r_d+2)d}$, and finally $C(E_d(r_d))=C_{p,d}$, contradiction;
- $*$ then $c_{id}, \quad i=0,\dots,r_d$, should be linearly independant and therefore the p-rank of $C(E_d(r_d))$ should be $\geq r_d+1>r_d$, which is impossible.

- Elsewhere, the group $C_{p,d}$ is not generated by the set of class of ideals

$$E_d(l)=\{c_{id} \quad | \quad i=0,\dots,l-1, \quad l<r_d,\}$$

if not the p-rank would be smaller than r_d.

- Note that $C_{p,d}\subset C_p^1$, without assuming any other hypothesis: $C_{p,d}=C_p^1$ or $C_{p,d}\neq C_p^1$ and therefore

$$r_d\leq r_p,$$

where r_p is the p-rank of the class group of $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$.

- Observe that the property $\prod_{i=0}^{p-2}\sigma^i(\mathbf{b})$ is a principal ideal implies that $r_1<p-1$.

- $F(r_d)=\oplus_{i=0}^{r_d-1}<c_{id}>$ can be seen as a $\mathbf{F_p}$-vector space of dimension r_d that we denote $\mathbf{F}_p.V_d$ in the sequel.

- With this definition, the set $\{c_{id}\mid i=0,\dots,r_d-1\}$ is a basis of the vector space $\mathbf{F}_p.V_d$,

- With this definition of the vector space $\mathbf{F}_p.V_d$, corresponds **one** representation $\rho_d : G_d\rightarrow \mathbf{GL}(\mathbf{F}_p.V_d)$ of degree r_d defined by:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\rho_d(\sigma^d)(c_{id})=c_{(i+1)d}, \quad i=0,\dots,r_d-2,\\
&\rho_d(\sigma^d)(c_{(r_d-1)d})=-\sum_{i=0}^{r_d-1}\lambda_{i,d}c_{id},\\
&\lambda_{i,d}\in\mathbf{F}_p, \quad \lambda_{0,d}\neq 0, \lambda_{r_d,d}=1,
\end{aligned}$$

the second relation meaning that

$$\mathbf{s}^{\lambda_{0,d}}\times\sigma^d(\mathbf{s})^{\lambda_{1,d}}\times\cdots\times\sigma^{d(r_d-1)}(\mathbf{s})^{\lambda_{r_d-1,d}}\times\sigma^{dr_d}(\mathbf{s})\simeq\mathbb{Z}[\zeta],$$

(with notation $\simeq\mathbb{Z}[\zeta]$ for principal).

- Observe that $\rho_d(\sigma^d)(c_{(r_d-1)d}) = c_{r_d d}$, therefore, we have the linear dependance relation

  $$L_d : \quad c_{r_d d} + \sum_{i=0}^{r_d-1} \lambda_{i,d} c_{id} = 0. \tag{6}$$

  The vector $c_{(r_d+1)d}$ can be computed by

  $$c_{(r_d+1)d} + \sum_{i=0}^{r_d-1} \lambda_{i,d} c_{(i+1)d} = 0. \tag{7}$$

  The vectors $c_{(i+1)d}, \quad i = r_d, \dots, \frac{p-1}{d} - 2$, can be explicitly computed successively in function of $\lambda_{i,d}, \quad i = 0, \dots, r_d - 1$ in this way.

- Observe that if $d = 1$ then $r_1 < p - 1$, and so $\rho_1 : G \to \mathbf{GL}(\mathbf{F}_p.V_1)$ corresponds to this definition.

- $\mathbf{F}_p.V_d$ can be seen as the sub-$\mathbf{F}_p[G_d]$-module of C_p^1 generated by action of the group G_d on group $< c_d >=< Cl(\sigma^d(\mathbf{b})) >$.

- Recall that $Cl(\mathbf{b})$ is the class of the ideal $\mathbf{b}$ of $\mathbb{Z}[\zeta]$. Observe that exponential notations $\mathbf{b}^\sigma$ can be used indifferently in the sequel. With this notation, we have
  - $\mathbf{b}^{\sigma^d} = \sigma^d(\mathbf{b})$.
  - For $\lambda \in \mathbf{F}_p$, we have $\mathbf{b}^{\sigma+\lambda} = \mathbf{b}^\lambda \times \sigma(\mathbf{b})$.
  - Let $P(\sigma) = \sigma^m + \lambda_{m-1}\sigma^{m-1} + \dots + \lambda_1\sigma + \lambda_0 \in \mathbf{F}_p[\sigma]$; then $\mathbf{b}^{P(\sigma)} = \sigma^m(\mathbf{b}) \times \sigma^{m-1}(\mathbf{b})^{\lambda_{m-1}} \times \dots \times \sigma(\mathbf{b})^{\lambda_1} \times \mathbf{b}^{\lambda_0}$.
  - Let us note $\mathbf{b}^{P(\sigma)} \simeq \mathbb{Z}[\zeta]$, if the ideal $\sigma^m(\mathbf{b}) \times \sigma^{m-1}(\mathbf{b})^{\lambda_{m-1}} \dots \sigma(\mathbf{b})^{\lambda_1} \times \mathbf{b}^{\lambda_0}$ is principal.
  - Let $P(\sigma), Q(\sigma) \in \mathbf{F}_p[\sigma]$; if $\mathbf{b}^{P(\sigma)} \simeq \mathbb{Z}[\zeta]$, then $\mathbf{b}^{(Q(\sigma)\times P(\sigma))} \simeq \mathbb{Z}[\zeta]$.
  - Observe that trivially $\mathbf{b}^{(\sigma^{p-1}-1)} \simeq \mathbb{Z}[\zeta]$.

- To relation L_d defined in relation (7) p.17, corresponds the monic minimal polynomial $P_{r_d}(V) \in \mathbf{F}_p[V]$, polynomial ring of the indeterminate V; the polynomial $P_{r_d}(V)$ verifies the relation, for $V = \sigma^d$:

  $$\mathbf{b}^{P_{r_d}(\sigma^d)} = \mathbf{b}^{(\sigma^{dr_d} + \sum_{i=0}^{r_d-1} \lambda_{i,d}\sigma^{di})} \simeq \mathbb{Z}[\zeta]. \tag{8}$$

  It is minimal because for all polynomials $R(V) \in \mathbf{F}_p(V), \quad R(V) \neq 0, \quad deg(R(V)) < deg(P_{r_d}(V))$, we have $\mathbf{b}^{R(\sigma^d)} \not\simeq \mathbb{Z}[\zeta]$. It means, with an other formulation in term of ideals, that $\prod_{i=0}^{r_d} \sigma^{id}(\mathbf{b})^{\lambda_{i,d}}$ is a principal ideal and that $\prod_{i=0}^{\alpha} \sigma^{id}(\mathbf{b})^{\beta_i}$ is not principal when $\alpha < r_d$ and $\beta_i, \quad i = 0, \dots, \alpha$, are not all simultaneously null.

2.3 Representations of Galois group $Gal(\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)/\mathbb{Q})$ in characteristic p.

In this subsection we give some general properties of representations of $G = Gal(\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)/\mathbb{Q})$ in characteristic p and obtain some results on the structure of the p-class group of $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$. Observe that we never use characters theory.

2.3.1 Some preliminary results

Lemma 2.1. *Let* $d \in \mathbb{N}, \quad p-1 \equiv 0$ *mod* d, *with the representation*

$$\rho_d : G_d \to \mathbf{GL}(\mathbf{F}_p.V_d)$$

defined in previous subsection 2.1 p. 15. Let V *be an indeterminate. Then the minimal polynomial* $P_{r_d}(V)$ *of the representation* ρ_d *verifies the factorization*

$$P_{r_d}(V) = \prod_{i=1}^{r_d}(V-\mu_{i,d}), \quad \mu_{i,d} \in \mathbf{F}_p, \quad i_1 \neq i_2 \Rightarrow \mu_{i_1} \neq \mu_{i_2}.$$

Proof. Let us consider the polynomials $A(V) = V^{p-1}-1$ and $P_{r_d}(V) \in \mathbf{F}_p[V]$. It is possible to divide the polynomial $A(V)$ by $P_{r_d}(V)$ in the polynomial ring $\mathbf{F}_p[V]$ to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}&A(V) = P_{r_d}(V) \times Q(V) + R(V), \quad Q(V), R(V) \in \mathbf{F}_p[V],\\ &d_R = deg_V(R(V)) < r_d = deg_V(P_{r_d}(V)).\end{aligned}$$

For $V = \sigma^d$, we get $\mathbf{b}^{(\sigma^{d(p-1)}-1)} \simeq \mathbb{Z}[\zeta]$ and $\mathbf{b}^{P_{r_d}(\sigma^d)} \simeq \mathbb{Z}[\zeta]$, so $\mathbf{s}^{R(\sigma^d)} \simeq \mathbb{Z}[\zeta]$. Suppose that $R(V) = \sum_{i=0}^{d_R} R_i V^i, \quad R_i \in \mathbf{F}_p$, is not identically null; then, it leads to the relation

$$\mathbf{b}^{(\sum_{i=0}^{d_R} R_i \sigma^{di})} \simeq \mathbb{Z}[\zeta],$$

where the R_i are not all zero, with $d_R < r_d$, which contradicts the minimality of the relation L_d, relation (7) p.17, and of the minimal polynomial $P_{r_d}(V)$. Therefore, $R(V)$ is identically null and we have

$$V^{p-1}-1 = P_{r_d}(V) \times Q(V).$$

The factorization of $V^{p-1}-1$ in $\mathbf{F}_p[V]$ is $V^{p-1}-1 = \prod_{i=1}^{p-1}(V-i)$. The factorization is unique in the euclidean ring $\mathbf{F}_p[V]$ and so $P_{r_d}(V) = \prod_{i=1}^{r_d}(V-\mu_{i,d}), \quad \mu_{i,d} \in \mathbf{F}_p, \quad i_1 \neq i_2 \Rightarrow \mu_{i_1} \neq \mu_{i_2}$, which achieves the proof. □

Lemma 2.2. *Let the representation* $\rho_1 : G \rightarrow \mathbf{GL}(\mathbf{F}_p.V_1)$ *of degree* r_1 *with minimal polynomial* $P_{r_1}(U)$ *of the indeterminate* U*. Let* $d \in \mathbb{N}$, $\quad p-1 \equiv 0 \mod d$, *be such that* $\rho_d : G_d \rightarrow \mathbf{GL}(\mathbf{F}_p.V_d)$ *is a representation of degree* r_d *of minimal polynomial* $P_{r_d}(W)$ *of the indeterminate* W*, as defined in previous subsection 2.1 p. 15. Then*

1. $P_{r_1}(U) = \prod_{i=1}^{r_1}(U-\mu_i), \quad \mu_i \in \mathbf{F}_p.$
2. $P_{r_d}(U^d) = \prod_{i=1}^{r_d}(U^d-\mu_i^d) = P_{r_1}(U) \times Q_d(U), \quad r_d \leq r_1, \quad Q_d(U) \in \mathbf{F}_p[U].$
3. *The* p*-ranks* r_1 *and* r_d *verify the inequalities*

   $$r_d \times d \geq r_1 \geq r_d. \tag{9}$$

4. *Let* K_d *be the intermediate field* $\mathbb{Q} \subset K_d \subset \mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$, $\quad [K_d : \mathbb{Q}] = d$*. Suppose that* p *does not divide the class number of* $K_d/\mathbb{Q}$*; then* $\mu_i^d \neq 1$ *for* $i = 1, \dots, r_d$*. In particular* $\mu_i \neq 1$ *for* $i = 1, \dots, r_1$*.*

Proof.

- Observe, at first, that $deg_U(P_{r_d}(U^d)) = d \times r_d \geq r_1$: if not, for the polynomial $P_{r_d}(U^d)$ in the indeterminate U, whe should have $deg_U(P_{r_d}(U^d)) < r_1$ and $P_{r_d}(\sigma^d) \circ \mathbf{b} \simeq \mathbb{Z}[\zeta]$ and, as previously, the polynomial $P_{r_d}(U^d)$ of the indeterminate U should be identically null.

- We apply euclidean algorithm in the polynomial ring $\mathbf{F}_p[U]$ of the indeterminate U. Therefore,

  $$\begin{aligned}&P_{r_d}(U^d) = P_{r_1}(U) \times Q(U) + R(U), \quad Q(U), R(U) \in \mathbf{F}_p[U],\\ &deg(R(U)) < deg(P_{r_1}(U)).\end{aligned}$$

  But we have $\mathbf{b}^{P_{r_d}(\sigma^d)} \simeq \mathbb{Z}[\zeta], \quad \mathbf{b}^{P_{r_1}(\sigma)} \simeq \mathbb{Z}[\zeta]$, therefore $\mathbf{b}^{R(\sigma)} \simeq \mathbb{Z}[\zeta]$. Then, similarly to proof of lemma 2.1 p.18, $R(U)$ is identically null and $P_{r_d}(U^d) = P_{r_1}(U) \times Q(U)$.

- Applying lemma 2.1 p.18, we obtain

  $$\begin{aligned}P_{r_1}(U) &= \prod_{i=1}^{r_1}(U-\mu_i), \quad \mu_i \in \mathbf{F}_p,\\ P_{r_d}(U^d) &= \prod_{i=1}^{r_d}(U^d-\mu_{i,d}), \quad \mu_{i,d} \in \mathbf{F}_p.\end{aligned}$$

- Then, we get

$$P_{r_d}(U^d) = \prod_{i=1}^{r_d}(U^d - \mu_{i,d}) = \prod_{i=1}^{r_1}(U - \mu_i) \times Q(U).$$

  There exists at least one $i, \quad 1 \leq i \leq r_d$, such that $(U^d - \mu_{i,d}) = (U - \mu_1) \times Q_1(U)$: if not, for all $i = 1, \ldots, r_d$, we should have $U^d - \mu_{i,d} \equiv R_i \bmod (U - \mu_1), \quad R_i \in \mathbf{F}_p - \{0\}$, a contradiction because $\prod_{i=1}^{r_d} R_i \neq 0$. We have $\mu_{i,d} = \mu_1^d$: if not $U - \mu_1$ should divide $U^d - \mu_{i,d}$ and $U^d - \mu_1^d$ and also $U - \mu_1$ should divide $(\mu_{i,d} - \mu_1^d) \in \mathbf{F}_p - \{0\}$, a contradiction. Therefore, there exists at least one $i, \quad 1 \leq i \leq r_d$, such that $\mu_{i,d} = \mu_1^d$ and $U^d - \mu_{i,d} = U^d - \mu_1^d = (U - \mu_1) \times Q_1(U)$. Then, generalizing to $\mu_{i,d}$ for all $i = 1, \ldots, r_d$, we get with a certain reordering of index i

$$P_{r_d}(U^d) = \prod_{i=1}^{r_d}(U^d - \mu_i^d) = \prod_{i=1}^{r_1}(U - \mu_i) \times Q(U).$$

- We have

$$P_{r_d}(U^d) = \prod_{i=1}^{r_d}(U^d - \mu_i^d).$$

  This relation leads to

$$P_{r_d}(U^d) = \prod_{i=1}^{r_d}\prod_{j=1}^{d}(U - \mu_i \mu_d^j),$$

  where $\mu_d \in \mathbf{F}_p, \quad \mu_d^d = 1$. We have shown that $P_{r_d}(U^d) = P_{r_1}(U) \times Q_d(U)$ and so $deg_U(P_{r_d}(U)) = d \times r_d \geq r_1$; thus $d \times r_d \geq r_1$.

- We finish by the proof of enumeration 4): suppose that, for some $i, \quad 1 \leq i \leq r_d$, we have $\mu_i^d = 1$ and search for a contradiction: there exists, for the indeterminate V, a polynomial $P_1(V) \in \mathbf{F}_p(V)$ such that $P_{r_d}(V) = (V - \mu_i^d) \times P_1(V) = (V - 1) \times P_1(V)$. But for $V = \sigma^d$, we have $\mathbf{b}^{P_{r_d}(\sigma^d)} \simeq \mathbb{Z}[\zeta]$, so $\mathbf{b}^{(\sigma^d P_1(\sigma^d) - P_1(\sigma^d))} \simeq \mathbb{Z}[\zeta]$. So, $\mathbf{b}^{P_1(\sigma^d)}$ is the class of an ideal $\mathbf{c}$ of $\mathbb{Z}[\zeta]$ with $Cl(\sigma^d(\mathbf{c})) = Cl(\mathbf{c})$; then $Cl(\sigma^{2d}(\mathbf{c})) = Cl(\sigma^d(\mathbf{c})) = Cl(\sigma^d(\mathbf{c})) = Cl(\mathbf{c})$. Then $Cl(\sigma^d(\mathbf{c}) \times \sigma^{2d}(\mathbf{c}) \times \cdots \times \sigma^{(p-1)d/d}(\mathbf{c})) = Cl(\mathbf{c}^{(p-1)/d})$. Let $\tau = \sigma^d$; then $Cl(\tau(\mathbf{c}) \times \tau^2(\mathbf{c}) \times \cdots \times \tau^{(p-1)/d}\mathbf{c})) = Cl(\mathbf{c}^{(p-1)/d})$; Then we deduce that $Cl(N_{\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)/K_d}(\mathbf{c})) = Cl(\mathbf{c}^{(p-1)/d})$ and thus $\mathbf{c}$ is a principal ideal because the ideal $N_{\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)/K_d}(\mathbf{c})$ of K_d is principal, (from hypothesis, p does not divide $h(K_d/\mathbb{Q})$); so $\mathbf{b}^{P_1(\sigma^d)} \simeq \mathbb{Z}[\zeta]$, which contradicts the minimality of the minimal polynomial equation $\mathbf{b}^{P_{r_d}(\sigma^d)} \simeq \mathbb{Z}[\zeta]$ because, for the indeterminate V, we would have $deg(P_1(V)) < deg(P_{r_d}(V))$, which achieves the proof.

$\square$

2.3.2 Preliminary on representations

We summarize some results obtained in:

Lemma 2.3. *Let* $\mathbf{b}$ *be an ideal of* $\mathbb{Z}[\zeta]$, $\mathbf{b}^p \simeq \mathbb{Z}[\zeta]$, $\mathbf{b} \not\simeq \mathbb{Z}[\zeta]$. *Let* $\rho_1 : G \to \mathbf{GL}(\mathbf{F}_p.V_1)$ *be the representation corresponding to* σ, *see definition in subsection 2.1 p. 15. Let* r_1 *be the degree of* ρ_1. *Let* $d \in \mathbb{N}$, $p-1 \equiv 0 \mod d$. *Let* $\sigma^d : \zeta \to \zeta^{u_d}$ *be the* $\mathbb{Q}$*-isomorphism of* $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$ *corresponding to* d. *Let* $\rho_d : G_d \to \mathbf{GL}(\mathbf{F}_p.V_d)$ *be the representation corresponding to* σ^d. *Let* r_d *be the degree of the representation* ρ_d. *Let, for the indeterminate* W,

$$P_{r_d}(W) = W^{r_d} + \lambda_{r_d-1,d}W^{r_d-1} + \cdots + \lambda_{1,d}W + \lambda_{0,d}$$

be the minimal polynomial corresponding to the representation ρ_d. *Then there exists* $\mu_1, \mu_2, \dots, \mu_{r_1} \in \mathbf{F}_p$, *with* $i \neq i' \Rightarrow \mu_i \neq \mu_i'$, *such that, for the indeterminate* U,

- *the minimal polynomials* $P_{r_1}(U)$ *and* $P_{r_d}(U^d)$ *are respectively given by*

$$P_{r_1}(U) = \prod_{i=1}^{r_1}(U-\mu_i),$$
$$P_{r_d}(U^d) = \prod_{i=1}^{r_d}(U^d-\mu_i^d), \quad r_d \leq r_1,$$
$$P_{r_1}(U) \mid P_{r_d}(U^d).$$

- *The coefficients of* $P_{r_d}(U^d)$ *are explicitly computable by*

$$P_{r_d}(U^d) =$$
$$U^{dr_d} - S_1(d)\times U^{d(r_d-1)} + S_2(d)\times U^{d(r_d-2)} + \cdots + (-1)^{r_d-1}S_{r_d-1}(d)\times U^d + (-1)^{r_d}S_{r_d}(d),$$
$$S_0(d) = \lambda_{r_d,d} = 1,$$
$$S_1(d) = -\lambda_{r_d-1,d} = \sum_{i=1,\dots,r_d} \mu_i^d,$$
$$S_2(d) = \lambda_{r_d-2,d} = \sum_{1\leq i_1<i_2\leq r_d} \mu_{i_1}^d\mu_{i_2}^d,$$
$$\vdots$$
$$S_{r_d}(d) = (-1)^{r_d}\lambda_{0,d} = \mu_1^d\mu_2^d\dots\mu_{r_d}^d.$$

- *Then the ideal*

$$\prod_{i=0}^{r_d}\sigma^{di}(\mathbf{b})^{(-1)^{r_d-i}\times S_{r_d-i}(d)} = \prod_{i=0}^{r_d}\sigma^{di}(\mathbf{b})^{\lambda_{i,d}} = \mathbf{b}^{P_{r_d}(\sigma^d)} \tag{10}$$

is a principal ideal.

Remark: For other annihilation methods of $Cl(\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)/\mathbb{Q})$ more involved, see for instance Kummer, in Ribenboim [39] p 119, (2C) and (2D) and Stickelberger in Washington [68] p 94 and 332.

2.4 On the structure of the p-class group of subfields of $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$

In this subsection on p-class group of cyclotomic fields, strictly independant of FLT equation, we deal of:

- a formulation, with our notations, of a Ribet's result on irregularity index.
- the action of $Gal(\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)/\mathbb{Q})$ on p-class groups of subfields of $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$,
- an inequality involving the p-rank of the group generated by the action of groups $G, G_d, G_g, \quad d|p-1, \quad g|p-1, \quad gcd(d,g)=1$ on ideals $\mathbf{b}$ of $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$,
- some relations obtained from Stickelberger theorem in $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$,
- some relations obtained from Stickelberger theorem in subfields of $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$,
- some congruences $\mod \pi^{p+1}$ connected to p-class group C_p of $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$ with consequences on structure of relative p-class group C_p^-,
- some congruences on all prime factors of class number h of $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$.
- an explicit formula for the computation of relative class number h^-.

2.4.1 Some definitions and notations

- Recall that:
  - C_p is the p-class group of $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$, subgroup of the class group C whose elements are of p-power order,
  - r_p is the p-rank of the class group of $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$,
  - C_p^1 is the subgroup of C_p whose elements are of order 1 or p.
- Let $G = Gal(\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)/\mathbb{Q})$ be the Galois group of the field $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$. Let, for $d|p-1$, G_d be the subgroup of d powers σ^{di} of elements σ^i of G.

- Suppose that $r_p > 0$. There always exists an ideal class with a representant $\mathbf{b} \subset \mathbb{Z}[\zeta]$, with $\mathbf{b}^p \simeq \mathbb{Z}[\zeta], \quad \mathbf{b} \not\simeq \mathbb{Z}[\zeta]$, which verifies, in term of representations, for some ideals $\mathbf{b}_i$ of $\mathbb{Z}[\zeta], \quad i = 1, \dots, r_p$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbf{b} \simeq \prod_{i=1}^{r_p} \mathbf{b}_i, \\
&\mathbf{b}_i^p \simeq \mathbb{Z}[\zeta], \quad \mathbf{b}_i \not\simeq \mathbb{Z}[\zeta], \quad i = 1, \dots, r_p, \\
(11) \qquad &\sigma(\mathbf{b}_i) \simeq \mathbf{b}_i^{\mu_i}, \quad \mu_i \in \mathbf{F}_p, \quad \mathbf{b}_i + \pi = \mathbb{Z}[\zeta], \quad i = 1, \dots, r_p, \\
&C_p^1 \cong \oplus_{i=1}^{r_p} < Cl(\mathbf{b}_i) >, \\
&P_{r_1}(U) = \prod_{i=1}^{r_1} (U - \mu_i), \quad \mathbf{b}^{P_{r_1}(\sigma)} \simeq \mathbb{Z}[\zeta], \quad 1 \leq r_1 \leq r_p,
\end{aligned}$$

where $P_{r_1}(U)$ is the minimal polynomial in the indeterminate U for the action of G on an ideal $\mathbf{b}$, see theorem 2.3 p 21. Recall that it is possible to encounter the case $\mu_i = \mu_j$ in the set $\{\mu_1, \dots, \mu_{r_p}\}$; by opposite if $U - \mu_i$ and $U - \mu_j$ divide the minimal polynomial $P_{r_1}(U)$ then $\mu_i \neq \mu_j$. r_1 is therefore the degree of the minimal polynomial $P_{r_1}(U)$.

- Let us denote $M_{r_1} = \{\mu_i \quad | \quad i = 1, \dots, r_1\}$.

- Let $d \in \mathbb{N}, \quad d | p-1, \quad 2 \leq d \leq \frac{p-1}{2}$. Let K_d be the field $\mathbb{Q} \subset K_d \subset \mathbb{Q}(\zeta), \quad [K_d : \mathbb{Q}] = d$.

- Let $P_{r_d}(V)$ be the minimal polynomial of the action of the group G_d on the ideal class group $< \mathbf{b} >$ of order p. Let r_d be the degree of $P_{r_d}(V)$.

2.4.2 On the irregularity index

Recall that r_p is the p-rank of the group C_p. The irregularity index is the number

$$i_p = Card\{B_{p-1-2m} \mid B_{p-1-2m} \equiv 0 \text{ mod } p, \quad 1 \leq m \leq \frac{p-3}{2}\},$$

where B_{p-1-2m} are even Bernoulli Numbers. The next theorem connects irregularity index and p-rank r_1 defined in relation (11) p. 23.

Theorem 2.4. **** With meaning of r_1 defined in relation (11) p. 23 then $i_p = r_1$. Moreover, if $h^+ \not\equiv 0$ mod p then $i_p = r_1 = r_p$.*

Proof. Let us consider in relation (11) the set of ideals $\{\mathbf{b}_i \mid i = 1, \dots, r_p\}$. The result of Ribet using theory of modular forms [44] mentionned in Ribenboim [39] (8C) p 190 can be formulated, with our notations,

$$(12) \qquad B_{p-1-2m} \equiv 0 \text{ mod } p \Leftrightarrow \exists i, \quad 1 \leq i \leq r_p, \quad \mathbf{b}_i^{\sigma - u_{2m+1}} \simeq \mathbb{Z}[\zeta].$$

There exists at least one such i, but it is possible for $i \neq i'$ that $\mathbf{b}_i^{\sigma-u_{2m+1}} \simeq \mathbf{b}_{i'}^{\sigma-u_{2m+1}} \simeq \mathbb{Z}[\zeta]$. The relation (12) implies that $i_p = r_1$. When $h^+ \not\equiv 0$ then $i_p = r_p$, see for instance Washington [68] in proof of theorem 6.18 p 102. $\square$

Remark: when $h^+ \not\equiv 0$ the relation $r_p = r_1$ is a reformulation of theorem 13.3 p. 143 proved in FLT context in an elementary way.

2.4.3 Inequalities involving degrees r_1, r_d, r_g of minimal polynomials $P_{r_1}(V), P_{r_d}(V), P_{r_g}(V)$ annihilating ideal b.

In this subsection, we always assume that $\mathbf{b}$ is defined by relation (11) p. 23.

Let $p > 3$ be a prime. Let $d, g \in \mathbb{N}$, with $gcd(d,g) = 1$ and $d \times g \mid p-1$. Recall that are the degree of the minimal polynomials $P_{r_1}(V), P_{r_d}(V), P_{r_g}(V)$ of the indeterminate V with $\mathbf{b}^{P_{r_1}(\sigma^d)} \simeq \mathbf{b}^{P_{r_d}(\sigma^d)} \simeq \mathbf{b}^{P_{r_g}(\sigma^g)} \simeq \mathbb{Z}[\zeta]$.

Lemma 2.5. *Let* $d \in \mathbb{N}, \quad 1 < d < p-1, \quad p-1 \equiv 0 \ mod\ d$. *If* $d \times r_1 \geq p-1$ *then* $r_d < r_1$.

Proof. For each $i = 1, \dots, r_1$, there are d values $\mu_{ji}, \quad j = 1, \dots, d$, such that $\mu_{ij}^d = \mu_i^d$. Therefore there are $d \times r_1$ values $\mu_{i,j}$ which cannot be all different, thus there exists at least two pairs (i_1, j_1) and (i_1, j_2) such that $\mu_{i_1,j_1} = \mu_{i_1,j_2}$ and so $r_d < r_1$. $\square$

The next theorem is a relation between the three degree r_1, r_d and r_g.

Theorem 2.6. **** Let* $d, g \in \mathbb{N}, \quad gcd(d,g) = 1, \quad d \times g \mid p-1$. *Then*

$$r_d \times r_g \geq r_1. \tag{13}$$

and if $r_d = 1$ *then* $r_g = r_1$.

Proof.

- Let us consider the minimal polynomials $P_{r_d}(U^d) = \prod_{i=1}^{r_d}(U^d - \mu_i^d)$ and $P_{r_g}(U^g) = \prod_{i=1}^{r_g}(U^g - \nu_j^g)$ of the indeterminate U with $\mathbf{b}^{P_{r_d}(\sigma^d)} \simeq \mathbb{Z}[\zeta]$ and $\mathbf{b}^{P_{r_g}(\sigma^g)} \simeq \mathbb{Z}[\zeta]$.
- From lemma 2.2 p.19, we have seen that $P_{r_1}(U) | P_{r_d}(U^d)$ and that similarly $P_{r_1}(U) | P_{r_g}(U^g)$, thus $P_{r_1}(U) | gcd(P_{r_d}(U^d), P_{r_g}(U^g))$.
- Let $M_{r_1} = \{\mu_i \quad | \quad i = 1, \dots, r_1\}$. Let us define

  $$C_1(\mu_i) = \{\mu_i \times \alpha_j \quad | \quad \alpha_j^d = 1, \quad j = 1, \dots, d\} \cap M_{r_1}, \quad i = 1, \dots, r_d.$$

  Let us define in the same way

  $$C_2(\nu_i) = \{\nu_i \times \beta_j \quad | \quad \beta_j^g = 1, \quad j = 1, \dots, g\} \cap M_{r_1}, \quad i = 1, \dots, r_g.$$

- We have proved in lemma 2.2 p.19 that $P_{r_1}(U)|P_{r_d}(U^d)$. Therefore the sets $C_1(\mu_i), \quad i=1,\dots,r_d$, are a partition of M_{r_1} and $r_1 = \sum_{i=1}^{r_d} Card(C_1(\mu_i))$.
- In the same way $P_{r_1}(U)|P_{r_g}(U^g)$. Therefore the sets $C_2(\nu_i), \quad i=1,\dots,r_g$, are a partition of M_{r_1} and $r_1 = \sum_{i=1}^{r_g} Card(C_2(\nu_i))$.
- There exists at least one $i \in \mathbb{N}, \quad 1 \le i \le r_d$, such that $Card(C_1(\mu_i)) \ge \frac{r_1}{r_d}$. For this i, let $\nu_1 = \mu_i \times \alpha_1, \quad \alpha_1^d = 1, \quad \nu_1 \in M_{r_1}$ and, in the same way, let $\nu_2 = \mu_i \times \alpha_2, \quad \alpha_2^d = 1, \quad \nu_2 \in M_{r_1}, \quad \nu_2 \ne \nu_1$. We have $\nu_1^g \ne \nu_2^g$: if not we should simultaneously have $\alpha_1^d = \alpha_2^d$ and $\alpha_1^g = \alpha_2^g$, which should imply, from $gcd(d,g)=1$, that $\alpha_1 = \alpha_2$, contradicting $\nu_1 \ne \nu_2$ and therefore we get $C_2(\nu_1) \ne C_2(\nu_2)$.
- Therefore, extending the same reasoning to all elements of $C_1(\mu_i)$, we get $\frac{r_1}{r_d} \le Card(C_1(\mu_i)) \le r_g$, which leads to the result.
- If $r_d = 1$ then $r_g \ge r_1$ and in an other part $r_g \le r_1$ and so $r_g = r_1$.

$\square$

Remark: Observe that $r_d = 0$ implies directly that $r_1 = 0$.

2.4.4 On Stickelberger's ideal in field $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$

In this subsection, we give a result resting on the annihilation of class group of $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$ by Stickelberger's ideal.

- Let us denote $\mathbf{a} \simeq \mathbf{c}$ when the two ideals $\mathbf{a}$ and $\mathbf{c}$ of $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$ are in the same ideal class.
- Let $G = Gal(\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)/\mathbb{Q})$.
- Let $\tau_a : \zeta \to \zeta^a, \quad a = 1,\dots,p-1$, be the $p-1$ $\mathbb{Q}$-isomorphisms of the field $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)/\mathbb{Q}$.
- Recall that u is a primitive root $\bmod p$, and that

  $\sigma : \zeta \to \zeta^u$ is a $\mathbb{Q}$-isomorphism of the field $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$ which generates G. Recall that, for $i \in \mathbb{N}$, then we denote u_i for $u^i \bmod p$ and $1 \le u_i \le p-1$.
- Let $\mathbf{b}$ be the not principal ideal defined in relation (11) p.23. Let $P_{r_1}(\sigma) \in \mathbf{F}_p[G]$ be the polynomial of minimal degree such that $P_{r_1}(\sigma)$ annihilates $\mathbf{b}$, so such that $\mathbf{b}^{P_{r_1}(\sigma)}$ is principal ideal, see lemma 2.1 p.18, and so

$$P_{r_1}(\sigma) = \prod_{i=1}^{r_1} (\sigma - \mu_i), \quad \mu_i \in \mathbf{F}_p, \quad i \ne i' \Rightarrow \mu_i \ne \mu'_i.$$

In the next result we shall explicitly use the annihilation of class group of $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$ by the Stickelberger's ideal.

Lemma 2.7. *Let* $P_{r_1}(U)=\prod_{i=1}^{r_1}(U-\mu_i)$ *be the polynomial of the indeterminate* U*, of minimal degree, such that* $\mathbf{b}^{P_{r_1}(\sigma)}$ *is principal. Then* $\mu_i \neq u, \quad i=1,\dots,r_1$.

Proof. Let $i \in \mathbb{N}, \quad 1 \leq i \leq r_1$. From relation (11) p.23, there exists ideals $\mathbf{b}_i \in \mathbb{Z}[\zeta], \quad i=1,\dots,r_p$, not principal and such that $\mathbf{b}=\prod_{i=1}^{r_p}\mathbf{b}_i$, with $\mathbf{b}_i^{\sigma-\mu_i}$ principal. Suppose that $\mu_i=u$, and search for a contradiction. Let us consider $\theta=\sum_{a=1}^{p-1}\frac{a}{p}\times\tau_a^{-1}\in\mathbb{Z}[G]$. $p\theta\in\mathbb{Z}[G]$ and the ideal $\mathbf{s}^{p\theta}$ is principal from Stickelberger's theorem, see for instance Washington [68], theorem 6.10 p 94. We can set $a=u^m, \quad a=1,\dots,p-1$, and m going through all the set $\{0,1,\dots,p-2\}$, because u is a primitive root $\mod p$. Then $\tau_a:\zeta\rightarrow\zeta^a$ and so $\tau_a^{-1}:\zeta\rightarrow\zeta^{(a^{-1})}=\zeta^{((u^m)^{-1})}=\zeta^{(u^{-m})}=\zeta^{(u^{p-1-m})}=\sigma^{p-1-m}=\sigma^{-m}$. Therefore, $\theta=\sum_{m=0}^{p-2}u^m\sigma^{-m}$. The element $\sigma-\mu_i=\sigma-u$ annihilates the class of $\mathbf{b}_i$ and also the element $u\times\sigma^{-1}-1$ annihilates the class of $\mathbf{b}_i$. Therefore $u^m\sigma^{-m}-1, \quad m=0,\dots,p-2$, annihilates the class of $\mathbf{b}_i$ and finally $p-1$ annihilates the class of $\mathbf{b}_i$, so $\mathbf{b}_i^{p-1}$ is principal, but $\mathbf{b}_i^p$ is also principal, and finally $\mathbf{b}_i$ is principal which contradicts our hypothesis and achieves the proof. □

2.4.5 π-adic congruences connected to p-relative class group C_p^-

In this subsection , we shall describe some π-adic congruences connected to p-relative class group C_p^-.

- Let C_p be the p-class group of $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$, C_p^1 be the subgroup of C_p whose elements are of order 1 or p.
- Let r_p be the p-rank of C_p, let r_p^+ be the p-rank of C_p^+ and r_p^- be the relative p-rank of C_p^-. Let us consider the ideals $\mathbf{b}$ defined in relation (11) p.23:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbf{b}=\mathbf{b}_1\times\cdots\times\mathbf{b}_{r_p^-}\times\mathbf{b}_{r_p^-+1}\times\cdots\times\mathbf{b}_{r_p},\\
&C_p^1=\oplus_{i=1}^{r_p}<Cl(\mathbf{b}_i)>,\\
&\mathbf{b}_i^p\simeq\mathbb{Z}[\zeta], \quad \mathbf{b}_i\not\simeq\mathbb{Z}[\zeta], \quad i=1,\dots,r_p,\\
&\sigma(\mathbf{b}_i)\simeq\mathbf{b}_i^{\mu_i}, \quad \mu_i\in\mathbf{F}_p^*, \quad i=1,\dots,r_p,\\
(14)\qquad &Cl(\mathbf{b}_i)\in C_p^-, \quad i=1,\dots,r_p^-,\\
&Cl(\mathbf{b}_i)\in C_p^+, \quad i=r_p^-+1,\dots,r_p,\\
&\mathbf{b}^{P_{r_1}(\sigma)}\simeq\mathbb{Z}[\zeta],\\
&\left(\frac{\mathbf{b}}{\overline{\mathbf{b}}}\right)^{P_{r_1^-}(\sigma)}\simeq\mathbb{Z}[\zeta].
\end{aligned}$$

Recall that $P_{r_1}(\sigma) \in \mathbf{F}_p[G]$ is the minimal polynomial such that $\mathbf{b}^{P_{r_1}(\sigma)} \simeq \mathbb{Z}[\zeta]$ with $r_1 \leq r_p$. Recall that $P_{r_1^-}(\sigma) \in \mathbf{F}_p[G]$ is the minimal polynomial such that $(\frac{\mathbf{b}}{\overline{\mathbf{b}}})^{P_{r_1}(\sigma)} \simeq \mathbb{Z}[\zeta]$ with $r_1^- \leq r_p^-$.

- We say that $C \in \mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$ is singular if $C\mathbb{Z}[\zeta] = \mathbf{c}^p$ for some ideal $\mathbf{c}$ of $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$. We say that C is singular primary if C is singular and $C \equiv c^p \bmod \pi^p, \quad c \in \mathbb{Z}, \quad c \not\equiv 0 \bmod p$.

Lemma 2.8. *There exists* $B_i \in \mathbb{Z}[\zeta], \quad i = 1, \dots, r_p^-$, *such that*

$$\begin{aligned} & B_i\mathbb{Z}[\zeta] = \mathbf{b}_i^p, \\ (15) \qquad & \sigma(\frac{B_i}{\overline{B_i}}) \times (\frac{B_i}{\overline{B_i}})^{-\mu_i} = (\frac{\alpha_i}{\overline{\alpha_i}})^p, \quad \alpha_i \in \mathbb{Q}(\zeta), \quad \alpha_i\mathbb{Z}[\zeta] + \pi = \mathbb{Z}[\zeta], \\ & \sigma(\frac{B_i}{\overline{B_i}}) \equiv (\frac{B_i}{\overline{B_i}})^{\mu_i} \ mod\ \pi^{p+1}, \quad \mu_i = u_{2m_i+1}. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Observe that we can neglect the $\mu_i = u_{2m_i}$ such that $\sigma - \mu_i$ annihilates ideal classes $\in C_p^+$, because we consider only quotients $\frac{B_i}{\overline{B_i}}$, with ideal classes $Cl(\mathbf{b}_i)$ in $C_p^-, \quad i = 1, \dots, r_p^-$. The ideal $\mathbf{b}_i^p$ is principal. So let one $\beta_i \in \mathbb{Z}[\zeta]$ with $\beta_i\mathbb{Z}[\zeta] = \mathbf{b}_i^p$. We have seen in relation (11) p.23 that $\sigma(\mathbf{b}_i) \simeq \mathbf{b}_i^{\mu_i}$, therefore there exists $\alpha_i \in \mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$ such that $\frac{\sigma(\mathbf{b}_i)}{\mathbf{b}_i^{\mu_i}} = \alpha_i\mathbb{Z}[\zeta]$, also $\frac{\sigma(\beta_i)}{\beta_i^{\mu_i}} = \varepsilon_i \times \alpha_i^p, \quad \varepsilon_i \in \mathbb{Z}[\zeta]^*$. Let $B_i = \delta_i^{-1} \times \beta_i, \quad \delta_i \in \mathbb{Z}[\zeta]^*$, for a choice of the unit δ_i that whe shall explicit in the next lines. We have

$$\sigma(\delta_i \times B_i) = \alpha_i^p \times (\delta_i \times B_i)^{\mu_i} \times \varepsilon_i.$$

Therefore

$$(16) \qquad \sigma(B_i) = \alpha_i^p \times B_i^{\mu_i} \times (\sigma(\delta_i^{-1}) \times \delta_i^{\mu_i} \times \varepsilon_i).$$

From Kummer's lemma on units, we can write

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_i &= \zeta^{v_1} \times \eta_1, \quad v_1 \in \mathbb{Z}, \quad \eta_1 \in \mathbb{Z}[\zeta + \zeta^{-1}]^*, \\ \varepsilon_i &= \zeta^{v_2} \times \eta_2, \quad v_2 \in \mathbb{Z}, \quad \eta_2 \in \mathbb{Z}[\zeta + \zeta^{-1}]^*. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore

$$\sigma(\delta_i^{-1}) \times \delta_i^{\mu_i} \times \varepsilon_i = \zeta^{-v_1u + v_1\mu_i + v_2} \times \eta, \quad \eta \in \mathbb{Z}[\zeta + \zeta^{-1}]^*.$$

From lemma 2.7 p.26, we deduce that $\mu_i \neq u$, therefore there exists one v_1 with $-v_1u + v_1\mu_i + v_2 \equiv 0 \bmod p$. Therefore, chosing this value v_1 for the unit δ_i,

$$\begin{aligned} (17) \qquad & \sigma(B_i) = \alpha_i^p \times B_i^{\mu_i} \times \eta, \quad \alpha_i\mathbb{Z}[\zeta] + \pi = \mathbb{Z}[\zeta], \quad \eta \in \mathbb{Z}[\zeta + \zeta^{-1}]^*, \\ & \sigma(\overline{B_i}) = \overline{\alpha_i}^p \times \overline{B_i}^{\mu_i} \times \eta. \end{aligned}$$

We have $\alpha_i \equiv \overline{\alpha}_i \bmod \pi$ and we have proved in proposition 1 p.73 that $\alpha_i^p \equiv \overline{\alpha}_i^p \bmod \pi^{p+1}$, which leads to the result. □

Lemma 2.9. *For each* $i = 1, \dots, r_p^-$, *there exists* $B_i \in \mathbb{Z}[\zeta]$, *such that*

$$\begin{aligned} &\mu_i = u_{2m_i+1}, \quad i = 1, \dots, r_p^-, \\ &B_i\mathbb{Z}[\zeta] = \mathbf{b}_i^p, \\ &C_i = \frac{B_i}{\overline{B_i}} \equiv 1 \ \mathit{mod}\ \pi^{2m_i+1}. \end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

Proof.

- Fix, without loss of generality, the index $i, \quad 1 \le i \le r_p$, in this proof. We have $B_i\mathbb{Z}[\zeta] + \pi = \mathbb{Z}[\zeta]$. Let $C(\zeta) = \frac{B_i}{\overline{B_i}}$. From the definition of $C(\zeta)$ we see that the valuation $v_\pi(C(\zeta)) = 0$. We can write $C(\zeta)$ in the form

  $$\begin{aligned} &C(\zeta) = \frac{B_i}{\overline{B_i}} = c_0 + c_1 \times \zeta + \dots + c_{p-2} \times \zeta^{p-2}, \\ &c_i \in \mathbb{Q}, \quad v_p(c_i) \ge 0. \end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

  Observe at first that, from the definitions, $C(\zeta) \equiv 1 \text{ mod } \pi$.

- Let X be an indeterminate and $m \in \{0, 1\}$. Let us denote $C(X, m) = \sum_{i=0}^{p-2} c_i \times X^{iu^m}$.

- We have $C(\zeta, 0) = \sum_{i=0}^{p-2} c_i \times \zeta^i$ and $C(\zeta, 1) = \sum_{i=0}^{p-2} c_i \times \zeta^{ui} = \sigma(C(\zeta, 0))$. We have proved in lemma 2.8 p.27 that

  $$C(\zeta, 1) = \sigma(C(\zeta, 0)) \equiv C(\zeta, 0)^\mu \text{ mod } \pi^{p+1}. \tag{20}$$

  Let us denote $C'(\zeta, m)$ the derivative on X for $X = \zeta$. Using exactly the same technics of derivation on the indeterminate X that in subsection 8.3 p.81 and foundation theorem 9.1 p.89, we get

  $$C'(\zeta, 1) \equiv \mu \times C'(\zeta, 0) \times C(\zeta, 0)^{\mu-1} \text{ mod } \pi^{p-2}. \tag{21}$$

- We have $C(X, 1) = \sum_{i=0}^{p-2} c_i \times X^{iu}$ and so $C'(X, 1) = \sum_{i=1}^{p-2} c_i \times i \times u \times X^{iu-1}$. We have $C(X, 0) = \sum_{i=0}^{p-2} c_i \times X^i$ and so $C'(X, 0) = \sum_{i=1}^{p-2} c_i \times i \times X^{i-1}$. We have $C(\zeta, 0) \equiv 1 \text{ mod } \pi$. Thus we obtain

  $$u \times (\sum_{i=1}^{p-2} c_i \times i \times \zeta^{iu-1}) \equiv \mu \times (\sum_{i=1}^{p-2} c_i \times i \times \zeta^{i-1}) \text{ mod } \pi.$$

  A first congruence is $(u - \mu) \times (\sum_{i=1}^{p-2} c_i \times i) \equiv 0 \text{ mod } \pi$. We have seen in lemma 2.7 p.26 that $u \ne \mu$, so

  $$C'(1, 0) = \sum_{i=1}^{p-2} c_i \times i \equiv 0 \text{ mod } p. \tag{22}$$

- Let us define $C_1(X,m) = C'(X,m) \times X$. We have, multiplying relation (21) p.28 by ζ
$$C_1(\zeta,1) \equiv \mu \times C_1(\zeta,0) \times C(\zeta,0)^{\mu-1} \bmod \pi^{p-2}.$$
With a derivation on X for the value $X = \zeta$, we get
$$\begin{aligned} &C_1'(\zeta,1) \equiv \mu \times C_1'(\zeta,0) \times C(\zeta,0)^{\mu-1} \\ &+ \mu \times (\mu-1) \times C_1(\zeta,0) \times C(\zeta,0)^{\mu-2} \times C'(\zeta,0) \bmod \pi^{p-3}. \end{aligned} \tag{23}$$
Therefore
$$\begin{aligned} &C_1'(1,1) \equiv \mu \times C_1'(1,0) \times C(1,0)^{\mu-1} \\ &+ \mu \times (\mu-1) \times C_1(1,0) \times C(1,0)^{\mu-2} \times C'(1,0) \bmod p. \end{aligned}$$
We have $C_1(X,1) = u \times (\sum_{i=1}^{p-2} c_i \times i \times X^{iu})$ and so $C_1'(X,1) = u^2 \times (\sum_{i=1}^{p-2} c_i \times i^2 \times X^{iu-1})$. We have $C_1(X,0) = (\sum_{i=1}^{p-2} c_i \times i \times X^i)$, and so $C_1'(X,1) = (\sum_{i=1}^{p-2} c_i \times i^2 \times X^{i-1})$. We have seen that $C(1,0) \equiv 1 \bmod p$. We have proved in relation (22) p.28 that $C_1(1,0) \equiv C'(1,0) \equiv 0 \bmod p$. Gathering these results, we obtain
$$u^2 \times (\sum_{i=1}^{p-2} c_i \times i^2) \equiv \mu \times (\sum_{i=1}^{p-2} c_i \times i^2) \bmod p,$$
which leads to
$$(u_2 - \mu) \times (\sum_{i=1}^{p-2} c_i \times i^2) \equiv 0 \bmod p.$$
We have seen in lemma 2.8 p. 27 that $\mu = u_{2m+1}$ so that $u_2 - \mu \neq 0$, therefore
$$\sum_{i=1}^{p-2} c_i \times i^2 \equiv 0 \bmod p. \tag{24}$$

- Pursuing this induction, let us define
$$\begin{aligned} C_k(X,1) &= C_{k-1}'(X,1) \times X, \quad k = 2,\dots,p-2, \\ C_k(X,0) &= C_{k-1}'(X,0) \times X, \quad k = 2,\dots,p-2. \end{aligned}$$
For $k = 2$ we get, multiplying by ζ the relation (23) p.29,
$$\begin{aligned} &C_2(\zeta,1) \equiv \mu \times C_2(\zeta,0) \times C(\zeta,0)^{\mu-1} \\ &+ \mu \times (\mu-1) \times C_1(\zeta,0)^2 \times C(\zeta,0)^{\mu-2} \bmod \pi^{p-3}. \end{aligned} \tag{25}$$

As an other example, we have for $k = 3$,

$$C_3(\zeta,1) = \mu C_3(\zeta,0)C(\zeta,0)^{\mu-1}$$
$$+ 3\mu(\mu-1)C_2(\zeta,0)C_1(\zeta,0)C(\zeta,0)^{\mu-2} + \mu(\mu-1)(\mu-2)C_1(\zeta,0)^3C(\zeta,0)^{\mu-3}.$$

Pursuing, we have for $k > 1$ relations of general form,

(26)
$$C_k(\zeta,1) \equiv \mu \times C_k(\zeta,0) \times C(\zeta,0)^{\mu-1}$$
$$+ \sum_l \gamma_l \times C(\zeta,0)^{\alpha} \times C_{l_1}(\zeta,0)^{\alpha_1} \times \cdots \times C_{l_\nu}(\zeta,0)^{\alpha_\nu} \mod \pi^{p-1-k},$$
$$\gamma_l \in \mathbb{Q}(\zeta), \quad v_\pi(\gamma_l) \geq 0, \quad l_1,\dots,l_\nu \in \mathbb{N}-\{0\}, \quad l_1\alpha_1+\cdots+l_\nu\alpha_\nu = k, \quad \nu > 1.$$

By induction for $k < 2m+1$, we have $C_l(\zeta,0) \equiv 0 \mod \pi, \quad l = 1,\dots,k$, and $C_l(1,0) \equiv 0 \mod p, \quad l = 1,\dots,k$: this results of the induction formula

$$(u_k-\mu) \times C_k(1,0) = (u_k-\mu) \times (\sum_{i=1}^{p-2} c_i \times i^k) \equiv$$
$$\sum_l \gamma_l \times C_{l_1}(1,0)^{\alpha_1} \times \cdots \times C_{l_\nu}(1,0)^{\alpha_\nu} \equiv 0 \mod p, \quad \nu > 1, \quad l_1\alpha_1+\cdots+l_\nu\alpha_\nu = k.$$

- Pursuing for all $k < 2m+1$, we see that $u_k - \mu \neq 0$ and so

$$C_k(1,0) = \sum_{i=1}^{p-2} c_i \times i^k \equiv 0 \mod p.$$

Therefore

$$C_k(1,0) \equiv 0 \mod p, \quad k = 1,\dots,2m.$$

Similarly to relation (92) p.93 in foundation theorem reciprocal proof, we deduce

$$C^{(k)}(1,0) \equiv 0 \mod p, \quad k = 1,\dots,2m,$$

observing that $C'_{k-1}(X,0) \times X = C_k(X,0)$ and noting $C^{(k)}(X,0)$ for the k-eme derivate on X of $C(X,0)$. We deduce from Taylor formula, with $\lambda = \zeta - 1$, that

$$C(\zeta,0) \equiv C(1,0) + \lambda \times C'(1,0) + \cdots + \frac{\lambda^{2m}}{(2m)!} \times C^{(2m)}(1,0) \mod \pi^{2m+1}$$

which gives

$$C(\zeta,0) \equiv 1 \mod \pi^{2m+1},$$

which is the relation (18) p.28.

- Observe that the process stops at $k = 2m$, because we have $u_{2m+1} - \mu = 0$ and we can say nothing on $C_{2m+1}(1, 0)$ in this way.

$\square$

Remarks:

1. The previous proof allows to say more: else $\pi^{2m+1} \| C(\zeta, 0) - 1$ and $C(\zeta, 0)$ is not singular primary else $C(\zeta, 0) \equiv 1 \bmod \pi^p$ and $C(\zeta, 0)$ is singular primary: if $C_{2m+1}(1, 0) \equiv 0 \bmod p$ then relation (26) p. 30 shows that $C_{2m+2}(1, 0) \equiv \cdots \equiv C_{2(2m+1)}(1, 0) \equiv 0 \bmod p$ and so on; then $C_1(1, 0) \equiv \cdots \equiv C_{p-2}(1, 0) \equiv 0 \bmod p$ and so $C(\zeta, 0) \equiv 1 \bmod \pi^{p-1}$. We derive that $C(\zeta, 0) \equiv 1 \bmod \pi^p$ from the complementary property that $C(\zeta, 1) - \mu C(\zeta, 0) \equiv 0 \bmod \pi^{p+1}$: we have seen that $C(\zeta, 0) = 1 + pV, \quad V \in \mathbb{Q}(\zeta), \quad v_\pi(V) \geq 0$; then $C(\zeta, 1) = 1 + p\sigma(V)$ and $C^\mu \equiv 1 + p\mu V \bmod \pi^p$; $C(\zeta, 1) - C(\zeta, 0)^\mu \equiv p(\sigma(V) - \mu V) \bmod \pi^p$, so $\sigma(V) - \mu V \equiv 0 \bmod \pi$, also $(1 - \mu)V \equiv 0 \bmod \pi$, and finally $V \equiv 0 \bmod \pi$.

2. In previous lemma 2.9 p. 28 we have seen that

$$C(\zeta, 0) \equiv 1 + \frac{C_{2m+1}(1, 0)}{(2m + 1)!} \lambda^{2m+1} \bmod \pi^{2m+2},$$

   where $C_1(1, 0) \equiv \cdots \equiv C_{2m}(1, 0) \equiv 0 \bmod p$ implies that $C_{2m+1}(1, 0) \equiv C^{(2m+1)}(1, 0) \bmod \pi^{p-1}$. The choice of the determination ideal $\mathbf{b}_i, \quad \sigma(\mathbf{b}_i) \simeq \mathbf{b}_i^{\mu_i}$ among the $p - 1$ not principal classes of $< Cl(\mathbf{b}_i) >$ is arbitrary and if $C(\zeta, 0)$ is not singular primary, equivalent to $C_{2m+1}(1, 0) \not\equiv 0 \bmod p$, it is always possible to choose the determination $\mathbf{b}_i$ such that $C_{2m+1}(1, 0) \equiv 1 \bmod p$, determination chosen in the sequel.

Theorem 2.10. **** Let $C = C_1^{\alpha_1} \dots C_m^{\alpha_m}$ with $\alpha_i \in \mathbf{F}_p^*, \quad i = 1, \dots, m$. Then C is singular primary if and only if all the $C_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, m$, are all singular primary.*

Proof.

- If $C_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, m$, are all singular primary, then C is clearly singular primary.
- Suppose that $C_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, l$, are not singular primary and that $C_i, \quad i = l + 1, \dots, m$, are singular primary. Then, from lemma 2.9 p.28 and remark following it, $\pi^{2m_i+1} \| C_i - 1, \quad i = 1, \dots, l$, where we suppose, without loss of generality, that $1 < 2m_1 + 1 < \cdots < 2m_l + 1$. Then $\pi^{2m_1+1} \| C - 1$ and so C is not singular primary.

$\square$

Lemma 2.11. *Let $C(\zeta)$ defined in relation (19) p. 28. If $C(\zeta)$ is not singular primary, then*

$$C(\zeta) \equiv 1 + V(\mu) \ mod\ \pi^{p-1}, \quad \mu = u_{2m+1} \quad V(\mu) \in \mathbb{Z}[\zeta],$$

where $V(\mu)$ mod p depends only on μ with $\pi^{2m+1} \| V(\mu)$.

Proof. If $C(\zeta)$ is not singular primary then, from relation (26) p. 30, $C_{2m+2}(1,0), \dots, C_{p-2}(1,0)$ and so $C^{(2m+2)}(1,0), \dots, C^{(p-2)}(1,0)$ can be derived of $C_{2m+1}(1,0)$ with relations depending only of μ, which achieves the proof. □

Theorem 2.12. **** Let C_1, C_2 defined by relation (19) p. 28. If $\mu_1 = \mu_2$ then C_1 and C_2 are singular primary.*

Proof. Let $\mu_1 = \mu_2 = \mu = u_{2m+1}$. From previous lemma 2.11 p. 32 we get

$$\begin{aligned} C_1 &= 1 + V(\mu) + pW_1, \quad W_1 \in \mathbb{Q}(\zeta), \quad v_\pi(V(\mu)) \geq 2m+1, \quad v_\pi(W_1) \geq 0, \\ C_2 &= 1 + V(\mu) + pW_2, \quad W_2 \in \mathbb{Q}(\zeta), \quad v_\pi(V(\mu)) \geq 2m+1, \quad v_\pi(W_2) \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Elsewhere, C_1, C_2 verify

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma(C_1) &\equiv C_1^\mu \bmod \pi^{p+1}, \\ \sigma(C_2) &\equiv C_2^\mu \bmod \pi^{p+1}, \end{aligned}$$

which leads to

$$\begin{aligned} 1 + \sigma(V(\mu)) + p\sigma(W_1) &\equiv 1 + A(\mu) + p\mu W_1 \bmod \pi^{p+1}, \\ 1 + \sigma(V(\mu)) + p\sigma(W_2) &\equiv 1 + A(\mu) + p\mu W_2 \bmod \pi^{p+1}, \end{aligned}$$

where $A(\mu) \in \mathbb{Q}(\zeta), \quad v_\pi(A(\mu) \geq 0$ depends only on μ. By difference, we get

$$p(\sigma(W_1 - W_2)) \equiv p\mu(W_1 - W_2) \bmod \pi^{p+1},$$

which implies that

$$\sigma(W_1 - W_2) \equiv \mu(W_1 - W_2) \bmod \pi^2.$$

Let $W_1 - W_2 = a\lambda + b, \quad a, b \in \mathbb{Z}, \quad \lambda = \zeta - 1$. The previous relation implies that $b(1-\mu) \equiv 0 \bmod p$ and so that $b \equiv 0 \bmod p$. Thus $W_1 - W_2 \equiv 0 \bmod \pi$ and finally $C_1 \equiv C_2 \bmod \pi^p$ and also $C_1 C_2^{-1} \equiv 1 \bmod \pi^p$ and $C_1 C_2^{-1}$ is singular primary, which shall imply that C_1 and C_2 are singular primary and shall achieve the proof:

1. C_1 not singular primary and C_2 singular primary should imply that $C_1 C_2^{-1}$ is not singular primary.

2. C_2 not singular primary and C_1 singular primary should imply that $C_1C_2^{-1}$ is not singular primary.

3. C_1 not singular primary and C_2 not singular primary should imply that $C_1C_2^{-1}$ is not singular primary from theorem 2.10 p. 31.

$\square$

Theorem 2.13. **** On structure of p-class group C_p.*

Let $\mathbf{b}_i$ be the ideals defined in relation (14) p. 26. Let $C_p^{1-} = \oplus_{i=1}^{r_p^-} < Cl(\mathbf{b}_i) >$. Let $C_i = \frac{B_i}{\overline{B}_i}, \quad B_i\mathbb{Z}[\zeta] = \mathbf{b}_i^p, \quad Cl(\mathbf{b}_i) \in C_p^-, \quad i = 1, \dots, r_p^-$, where B_i is defined in relation (17) p. 27. Let r_1^- be the degree of the minimal polynomial $P_{r_1^-}(\sigma)$ defined in relation (14) p. 26. With a certain ordering of $C_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, r_p^-$,

1. *C_i are singular primary for $i = 1, \dots, r_p^+$, and C_i are not singular primary for $i = r_p^+, \dots, r_p^-$.*
2. *If $\mu_i = \mu_j$ then $1 \leq i < j \leq r_p^+ \leq r_p^-$ and C_i, C_j are singular primary.*
3. *If $h^+ \equiv 0 \bmod p$ then $r_p^- - r_p^+ + 1 \leq r_1^- \leq r_p^-$.*
4. *If $h^+ \not\equiv 0 \bmod p$ then $r_1^- = r_p^-$.*

Proof.

1. It is an application of Hilbert class field theorem 4.3 56 which is a forward independant reference : there are r_p^+ singular primary C_i with $Cl(\mathbf{b}_i) \in C_p^-$.
2. lemma 2.12 p. 32
3. Reformulation of previous items, observing that if $r_p^+ > 0$ then $\mu_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, r_p^+$ take at least one value μ and at most r_p^+ different values μ.
4. If $h^+ \not\equiv 0 \bmod p$ there are no C_i singular primary.

$\square$

Lemma 2.14. *Let, for $i = 1, \dots, r_p^-$, the ideals $\mathbf{b}_i$ with $Cl(\mathbf{b}_i) \in C_p^-$ defined in relation (14) p. 26. Let $C_i = \frac{B_i}{\overline{B}_i}, \quad B_i \in \mathbb{Z}[\zeta], \quad i = 1, \dots, r_p^-$, defined in relation (18) p. 28. There exists $B_{i,1} = \frac{B_i^2}{\eta_i}, \quad \eta_i \in \mathbb{Z}[\zeta + \zeta^{-1}]^*$, such that*

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mu_i = u_{2m_i+1}, \quad i = 1, \dots, r_p^-, \\
&\sigma(B_{i,1}) = B_{i,1}^{\mu_i} \times \alpha_i^p, \quad \alpha_i \in \mathbb{Q}(\zeta), \\
&B_{i,1}\mathbb{Z}[\zeta] = \mathbf{b}_i^{2p}, \quad B_{i,1} \in \mathbb{Z}[\zeta], \\
&B_{i,1}^{p-1} \equiv 1 \bmod \pi^{2m_i+1}.
\end{aligned} \tag{27}$$

Proof. We have $C_i\mathbb{Z}[\zeta] = \mathbf{b}_i^p$ where the ideal $\mathbf{b}_i$ verifies $\sigma(\mathbf{b}_i) \simeq \mathbf{b}_i^{\mu_i}$ and $Cl(\mathbf{b}_i) \in C_p^-$. Let us note C, B, μ for C_i, B_i, μ_i to simplify notations. From relation (17) p. 27 and from $Cl(\mathbf{b}_i) \in C_p^-$, we can choose B such that

$$\begin{aligned}
&C = \frac{B}{\overline{B}}, \quad B \in \mathbb{Z}[\zeta],\\
&B\overline{B} = \eta \times \gamma^p, \quad \eta \in \mathbb{Z}[\zeta+\zeta^{-1}]^*, \quad \gamma \in \mathbb{Q}(\zeta), \quad v_\pi(\gamma) = 0,\\
&\sigma(B) = B^\mu \times \alpha^p \times \varepsilon, \quad \mu = u_{2m+1}, \quad \alpha \in \mathbb{Q}(\zeta), \quad v_\pi(\alpha) = 0, \quad \varepsilon \in \mathbb{Z}[\zeta+\zeta^{-1}]^*.
\end{aligned}$$

We derive that

$$\sigma(B\overline{B}) = (B\overline{B})^\mu \times (\alpha\overline{\alpha})^p \times \varepsilon^2,$$

and so

$$\sigma(\eta) = \eta^\mu \times \varepsilon^2 \times \varepsilon_1^p, \quad \varepsilon_1 \in \mathbb{Z}[\zeta+\zeta^{-1}]^*.$$

We have seen that

$$\sigma(B^2) = B^{2\mu} \times \alpha^{2p} \times \varepsilon^2,$$

and so

$$\sigma(B^2) = B^{2\mu} \times \alpha^{2p} \times (\sigma(\eta)\eta^{-\mu}\varepsilon_1^{-p})$$

which leads to

$$\sigma(\frac{B^2}{\eta}) = (\frac{B^2}{\eta})^\mu \times \alpha_2^p, \quad \alpha_2 \in \mathbb{Q}(\zeta), \quad v_\pi(\alpha_2) = 0.$$

Let us note $B_1 = \frac{B^2}{\eta}, \quad B_1 \in \mathbb{Z}(\zeta), \quad v_\pi(B_1) = 0$. We get

$$\sigma(B_1) = B_1^\mu \times \alpha_2^p. \tag{28}$$

This relation (28) is similar to hypothesis of lemma 2.9 p. 28 which leads to $B_1 \equiv d_1^p \bmod \pi^{2m+1}, \quad d_1 \not\equiv 0 \bmod p$; Therefore $B_1^{p-1} \equiv 1 \bmod \pi^{2m+1}$, which achieves the proof. □

Lemma 2.15. *Let the ideals* $\mathbf{b}_i, \quad i = r_p^- + 1, \dots, r_p$, *such that* $Cl(\mathbf{b}_i) \in C_p^+$ *defined in relation (14) p. 26. There exists* $B_i \in \mathbb{Z}(\zeta)$ *such that:*

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mu_i = u_{2m_i}, \quad i = r_p^- + 1, \dots, r_p,\\
&\sigma(\mathbf{b}_i) \simeq \mathbf{b}_i^{\mu_i},\\
&B_i\mathbb{Z}[\zeta] = \mathbf{b}_i^p,\\
&\sigma(B_i) = B_i^{\mu_i} \times \alpha_i^p, \quad \alpha_i \in \mathbb{Q}(\zeta),\\
&B_i \equiv 1 \ mod \ \pi^{2m_i}.
\end{aligned} \tag{29}$$

Proof. Similarly to relation (17) p. 27, there exists B_i with $B_i\mathbb{Z}[\zeta] = \mathbf{b}_i^p$ such that

$$\sigma(B_i) = B_i^{\mu_i} \times \alpha^p \times \eta, \quad \alpha \in \mathbb{Q}(\zeta), \quad \eta \in \mathbb{Z}[\zeta + \zeta^{-1}]^*.$$

From relation (40) p. 45, independant forward reference in section dealing of unit group $\mathbb{Z}[\zeta + \zeta^{-1}]^*$, we can write

$$\begin{aligned}
&\eta = (\prod_{j=1}^{N} \eta_j^{\lambda_i}) \times (\prod_{j=N+1}^{(p-3)/2} \eta_j^{\lambda^j}), \quad \lambda_j \in \mathbf{F}_p, \quad 1 \le N < \frac{p-3}{2},\\
&\sigma(\eta_j) = \eta_j^{\mu_i} \times \beta_j^p, \quad \eta_j, \beta_j \in \mathbb{Z}[\zeta + \zeta^{-1}]^*, \quad j = 1, \dots, N,\\
&\sigma(\eta_j) = \eta_j^{\nu_j} \times \beta_j^p, \quad \eta_j, \beta_j \in \mathbb{Z}[\zeta + \zeta^{-1}]^*, \quad j = N+1, \dots, \frac{p-3}{2},\\
&\nu_j \not\equiv \mu_i, \quad j = N+1, \dots, \frac{p-3}{2}.
\end{aligned}$$

Let us note

$$E = \prod_{j=1}^{N} \eta_j^{\lambda_j}, \quad U = \prod_{j=N+1}^{(p-3)/2} \eta_j^{\lambda_j}.$$

Show that there exists $V \in \mathbb{Z}[\zeta + \zeta^{-1}]^*$ such that $\sigma(V) \times V^{-\mu_i} = U \times \varepsilon^p, \quad \varepsilon \in \mathbb{Z}[\zeta + \zeta^{-1}]^*$: Let us set $V = \prod_{j=N+1}^{(p-3)/2} \eta_j^{\rho_i}$. It suffices that

$$\eta_j^{\rho_j \nu_j} \times \eta_j^{-\rho_j \mu_i} = \eta_j^{\lambda_j} \times \varepsilon_j^p, \quad \varepsilon_j \in \mathbb{Z}[\zeta + \zeta^{-1}]^*, \quad j = N+1, \dots, \frac{p-3}{2}.$$

It suffices that

$$\rho_j \equiv \frac{\lambda_j}{\nu_j - \mu_i} \bmod p, \quad j = N+1, \dots, \frac{p-3}{2},$$

which is possible, because $\nu_j \not\equiv \mu_i, \quad j = N+1, \dots, \frac{p-3}{2}$. Therefore, for $B_i' = B_i \times V$, we get simultaneously

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sigma(B_i') = (B_i')^{\mu_i} \times \alpha_i^p \times E, \quad \alpha_i \in \mathbb{Q}(\zeta),\\
&\sigma(E) = E^{\mu_i} \times \varepsilon_1^p, \quad \varepsilon_1 \in \mathbb{Z}[\zeta + \zeta^{-1}]^*.
\end{aligned}$$

If $E \in (\mathbb{Z}[\zeta + \zeta^{-1}]^*)^p \Leftrightarrow \lambda_j = 0, \quad j = 1, \dots, N$, then we get

$$\sigma(B_i') = (B_i')^{\mu_i} \times (\alpha_i')^p. \tag{30}$$

If $E \notin (\mathbb{Z}[\zeta + \zeta^{-1}]^*)^p$ then by conjugation,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sigma(B_i') = (B_i')^{\mu_i} \times \alpha_i^p \times E, \quad a_i \in \mathbb{Q}(\zeta),\\
&\sigma^2(B_i') = \sigma(B_i')^{\mu_i} \times E^{\mu_i} \times b_i^p, \quad b_i \in \mathbb{Q}(\zeta),
\end{aligned}$$

and so

$$c^p \times \sigma(B_i')^{\mu_i}(B_i')^{-\mu_i^2} = \sigma^2(B_i')\sigma(B_i')^{-\mu_i}, \quad c \in \mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$$

which leads to

$$(B_i')^{(\sigma-\mu_i)^2} = c^p, \quad c \in \mathbb{Q}(\zeta).$$

Elsewhere $(B_i')^{\sigma^{p-1}-1} = 1$, so

$$(B_i')^{gcd((\sigma^{p-1}-1,(\sigma-\mu_i)^2)} = (B_i')^{\sigma-\mu_i} = \alpha_i^p, \quad \alpha_i \in \mathbb{Q}(\zeta),$$

and so $\sigma(B_i') = (B_i')^{\mu_i} \times \alpha_i^p$. The end of proof is similar to proof of previous lemma 2.14 p. 33. □

The next important theorem summarize the two previous lemmas and give explicit congruences $\bmod p$ connected to p-class group of $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$.

Theorem 2.16. **** π-adic structure of p-class group C_p*

Let the ideals $\mathbf{b}_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, r_p$, such that $Cl(\mathbf{b}_i) \in C_p$ and defined by relation (14) p. 26. Then, there exists $B_i \in \mathbb{Z}(\zeta), \quad i = 1, \dots, r_p$, such that

$$\begin{aligned} &\mu_i = u_{m_i}, \quad i = 1, \dots, r_p, \\ &\sigma(\mathbf{b}_i) \simeq \mathbf{b}_i^{\mu_i}, \\ &B_i\mathbb{Z}[\zeta] = \mathbf{b}_i^p, \\ &\sigma(B_i) = B_i^{\mu_i} \times \alpha_i^p, \quad \alpha_i \in \mathbb{Q}(\zeta), \\ &B_i \equiv 1 \ mod \ \pi^{m_i}. \end{aligned} \tag{31}$$

Moreover, among them:

1. *the r_p^+ algebraic integers $B_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, r_p^+$, corresponding to $\mathbf{b}_i \in C_p^-$ and $C_i = \frac{B_i}{\overline{B}_i}$ singular primary, verify $B_i \equiv 1 \ mod \ \pi^p$.*

2. *the $r_p - r_p^+$ other algebraic integers $B_i, \quad i = r_p^+ + 1, \dots, r_p$ verify $\pi^{m_i} \| (B_i - 1)$.*

Proof. Apply lemmas 2.14 p. 33 and 2.15 p. 34 and theorem 2.13 p. 33. □

2.4.6 The case $\mu = u_{2m+1}, \quad 2m + 1 > \frac{p-1}{2}$

In the next lemma we shall investigate more deeply the consequences of the congruence $C \equiv 1 \bmod \pi^{2m+1}$ of lemma 2.9 p. 28 when $2m + 1 > \frac{p-1}{2}$.

Lemma 2.17. *Let C with $\mu = u_{2m+1}, \quad 2m + 1 > \frac{p-1}{2}$.*

$$\begin{aligned} &C = 1 + \gamma + \gamma_0\zeta + \gamma_1\zeta^u + \dots + \gamma_{p-3}\zeta^{u_{p-3}}, \\ &\gamma \in \mathbb{Q}, \quad v_p(\gamma) \ge 0, \quad \gamma_i \in \mathbb{Q}, \quad v_p(\gamma_i) \ge 0, \quad i = 0, \dots, p-3, \\ &\gamma + \gamma_0\zeta + \gamma_1\zeta^u + \dots + \gamma_{p-3}\zeta^{u_{p-3}} \equiv 0 \ mod \ \pi^{2m+1}, \quad 2m + 1 > \frac{p-1}{2}. \end{aligned}$$

Then C verifies the congruences

$$\begin{aligned}
&\gamma \equiv -\frac{\gamma_{p-3}}{\mu-1} \ \mathit{mod}\ p,\\
&\gamma_0 \equiv -\mu^{-1} \times \gamma_{p-3} \ \mathit{mod}\ p,\\
&\gamma_1 \equiv -(\mu^{-2}+\mu^{-1}) \times \gamma_{p-3} \ \mathit{mod}\ p,\\
&\vdots\\
&\gamma_{p-4} \equiv -(\mu^{-(p-3)}+\cdots+\mu^{-1}) \times \gamma_{p-3} \ \mathit{mod}\ p.
\end{aligned}$$

Proof. We have seen in lemma 2.8 p. 27 that $\sigma(C) \equiv C^{\mu} \bmod \pi^{p+1}$. From $2m+1 > \frac{p-1}{2}$ we derive that

$$C^{\mu} \equiv 1 + \mu \times (\gamma + \gamma_0\zeta + \gamma_1\zeta^{u} + \cdots + \gamma_{p-3}\zeta^{u_{p-3}}) \bmod \pi^{p-1}.$$

Elsewhere, we get by conjugation

$$\sigma(C) = 1 + \gamma + \gamma_0\zeta^{u} + \gamma_1\zeta^{u_2} + \cdots + \gamma_{p-3}\zeta^{u_{p-2}}. \tag{32}$$

We have the identity

$$\gamma_{p-3}\zeta^{u_{p-2}} = -\gamma_{p-3} - \gamma_{p-3}\zeta - \cdots - \gamma_{p-3}\zeta^{u_{p-3}}.$$

This leads to

$$\sigma(C) = 1 + \gamma - \gamma_{p-3} - \gamma_{p-3}\zeta + (\gamma_0 - \gamma_{p-3})\zeta^{u} + \cdots + (\gamma_{p-4} - \gamma_{p-3})\zeta^{u_{p-3}}.$$

Therefore, from the congruence $\sigma(C) \equiv C^{\mu} \bmod \pi^{p+1}$ we get the congruences in the basis $1, \zeta, \zeta^{u}, \dots, \zeta^{u_{p-3}}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&1 + \mu\gamma \equiv 1 + \gamma - \gamma_{p-3} \bmod p,\\
&\mu\gamma_0 \equiv -\gamma_{p-3} \bmod p,\\
&\mu\gamma_1 \equiv \gamma_0 - \gamma_{p-3} \bmod p,\\
&\mu\gamma_2 \equiv \gamma_1 - \gamma_{p-3} \bmod p,\\
&\vdots\\
&\mu\gamma_{p-4} \equiv \gamma_{p-5} - \gamma_{p-3} \bmod p,\\
&\mu\gamma_{p-3} \equiv \gamma_{p-4} - \gamma_{p-3} \bmod p.
\end{aligned}$$

From these congruences, we get $\gamma \equiv -\frac{\gamma_{p-3}}{\mu-1} \bmod p$ and $\gamma_0 \equiv -\mu^{-1}\gamma_{p-3} \bmod p$ and then $\gamma_1 \equiv \mu^{-1}(\gamma_0 - \gamma_{p-3}) \equiv \mu^{-1}(-\mu^{-1}\gamma_{p-3} - \gamma_{p-3}) \equiv -(\mu^{-2}+\mu^{-1})\gamma_{p-3} \bmod p$ and $\gamma_2 \equiv \mu^{-1}(\gamma_1 - \gamma_{p-3}) \equiv \mu^{-1}(-(\mu^{-2}+\mu^{-1})\gamma_{p-3} - \gamma_{p-3}) \equiv -(\mu^{-3}+\mu^{-2}+\mu^{-1})\gamma_{p-3} \bmod p$ and so on. □

The next theorem gives an explicit important formulation of C when $2m+1 > \frac{p-1}{2}$.

Theorem 2.18. **** Let $\mu = u_{2m+1}, \quad p-2 \geq 2m+1 > \frac{p-1}{2}$, corresponding to C defined in lemma 2.9 p. 28, so $\sigma(C) \equiv C^\mu$ mod π^{p+1}. Then C verifies the formula:*

$$C \equiv 1 - \frac{\gamma_{p-3}}{\mu-1} \times (\zeta + \mu^{-1}\zeta^u + \dots + \mu^{-(p-2)}\zeta^{u_{p-2}}) \ mod\ \pi^{p-1}. \tag{33}$$

Proof. From definition of C, setting $C = 1 + V$, we get :

$$\begin{aligned}
&C = 1 + V,\\
&V = \gamma + \gamma_0\zeta + \gamma_1\zeta^u + \dots + \gamma_{p-3}\zeta^{u_{p-3}},\\
&\sigma(V) \equiv \mu \times V \text{ mod } \pi^{p+1}.
\end{aligned}$$

Then, from lemma 2.17 p. 36, we obtain the relations

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mu = u_{2m+1},\\
&\gamma \equiv -\frac{\gamma_{p-3}}{\mu-1} \text{ mod } p,\\
&\gamma_0 \equiv -\mu^{-1} \times \gamma_{p-3} \text{ mod } p,\\
&\gamma_1 \equiv -(\mu^{-2} + \mu^{-1}) \times \gamma_{p-3} \text{ mod } p,\\
&\vdots\\
&\gamma_{p-4} \equiv -(\mu^{-(p-3)} + \dots + \mu^{-1}) \times \gamma_{p-3} \text{ mod } p,\\
&\gamma_{p-3} \equiv -(\mu^{-(p-2)} + \dots + \mu^{-1}) \times \gamma_{p-3} \text{ mod } p.
\end{aligned}$$

From these relations we get

$$V \equiv -\gamma_{p-3} \times (\frac{1}{\mu-1} + \mu^{-1}\zeta + (\mu^{-2} + \mu^{-1})\zeta^u + \dots + (\mu^{-(p-2)} + \dots + \mu^{-1})\zeta^{u_{p-3}}) \text{ mod } p.$$

Then

$$V \equiv -\gamma_{p-3} \times (\frac{1}{\mu-1} + \mu^{-1}(\zeta + (\mu^{-1} + 1)\zeta^u + \dots + (\mu^{-(p-3)} + \dots + 1)\zeta^{u_{p-3}})) \text{ mod } p.$$

Then

$$V \equiv -\gamma_{p-3} \times (\frac{1}{\mu-1} + \mu^{-1}(\frac{(\mu^{-1}-1)\zeta + (\mu^{-2}-1)\zeta^u + \dots + (\mu^{-(p-2)}-1)\zeta^{u_{p-3}}}{\mu^{-1}-1})) \text{ mod } p.$$

Then

$$V \equiv -\gamma_{p-3} \times (\frac{1}{\mu-1} + \mu^{-1}(\frac{\mu^{-1}\zeta + \mu^{-2}\zeta^u + \dots + \mu^{-(p-2)}\zeta^{u_{p-3}} - \zeta - \zeta^u - \dots - \zeta^{u_{p-3}}}{\mu^{-1}-1})) \text{ mod } p.$$

Then

$$V \equiv -\gamma_{p-3}\times(\frac{1}{\mu-1}+\mu^{-1}(\frac{1+\mu^{-1}\zeta+\mu^{-2}\zeta^u+\dots+\mu^{-(p-2)}\zeta^{u_{p-3}}+\mu^{-(p-1)}\zeta^{u_{p-2}}}{\mu^{-1}-1})) \bmod p.$$

Then

$$V \equiv -\gamma_{p-3}\times(\frac{1}{\mu-1})\times(1-(1+\mu^{-1}\zeta+\mu^{-2}\zeta^u+\dots+\mu^{-(p-2)}\zeta^{u_{p-3}}+\mu^{-(p-1)}\zeta^{u_{p-2}})) \bmod p.$$

Then

$$V \equiv -\gamma_{p-3}\times(\frac{\mu^{-1}}{\mu-1})\times(\zeta+\mu^{-1}\zeta^u+\dots+\mu^{-(p-3)}\zeta^{u_{p-3}}+\mu^{-(p-2)}\zeta^{u_{p-2}}) \bmod p.$$

□

2.4.7 On the prime factors of the class number h of $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$.

In this subsection, we shall explicit some congruences on prime factors of class number h of $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$, with a comparison with results given in Masley [32] corollary 3.5 p 287 and in Washington[68], theorem 10.8 p 187. The knowledge of prime factors of h can also be seen as a tool for FLT first case, in giving a criterion for a prime factor of h to be different of p.

- Let C_p be the p-class group of $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$ and C_p^1 be the subgroup of C_p whose elements are of order 1 or p.
- Let $p-1 = 2^m \times n$ where n is odd.
- Let K be the intermediate field $\mathbb{Q} \subset K \subset \mathbb{Q}(\zeta), \quad [K:\mathbb{Q}] = n$. Let B_K be the ring of integers of the field K.
- Let $\theta : K \to K$ be a $\mathbb{Q}$-isomorphism.
- Let h_K be the class number of K, with classically $h \equiv 0 \bmod h_K$.
- Let us denote q a prime odd divisor of h_K.
- Let $\mathbf{F}_q$ be the finite field of cardinal q.
- When $p-1 \not\equiv 0 \bmod q$, we can translate, *mutatis mutandis*, our description of p-class group C_p^1 of $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$ seen as $\mathbf{F}_p[G]$ module, where G is the Galois group of $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)/\mathbb{Q}$, to the description of q-class group C_q^1 with rank r_q of the field K, with (cyclic) Galois group $G_K \subset G$, seen as a $\mathbf{F}_q[G_K]$ module.

- Let q be a prime with $p-1 \not\equiv 0 \bmod q$. There exists an ideal $\mathbf{c}$ of K such that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbf{c} \not\simeq B_K, \quad \mathbf{c}^q \simeq B_K,\\
&\mathbf{c} \simeq \mathbf{c}_1 \dots \mathbf{c}_{r_q},\\
&\mathbf{c}_i \not\simeq B_K, \quad \mathbf{c}_i^q \simeq B_K, \quad \mathbf{c}_i^{\theta-\mu_i} \simeq B_K, \quad i = 1, \dots, r_q.
\end{aligned}$$

- There exists a minimal polynomial $P_{r_1}(V), \quad r_1 \leq r_q$, of the indeterminate V such that

$$\mathbf{c}^{P_{r_1}(\theta)} \simeq B_K, \quad P_{r_1}(V) = \prod_{i=1}^{r_1}(V-\mu_i), \quad \mu_i \in \mathbf{F}_q, \quad i_1 \neq i_2 \Rightarrow \mu_{i_1} \neq \mu_{i_2}.$$

Theorem 2.19. *****

Let $p-1 = 2^m \times n$ with n odd. Let K be the field $\mathbb{Q} \subset K \subset \mathbb{Q}(\zeta), \quad [K:\mathbb{Q}] = n$. Let h_K be the class number of the field K. Let $q > 2$ be a prime divisor of h_K not dividing $p-1$. Then $Gcd(n, q-1) \neq 1$.

Proof. From $\mathbf{c}_1^{\theta-\mu_1} \simeq B_K$ for the ideal $\mathbf{c}_1$ of K, we get $\theta(\mathbf{c}_1) \simeq \mathbf{c}_1^{\mu_1}$, so

$$N_{K/\mathbb{Q}}(\mathbf{c}_1) = \mathbf{c}_1 \times \theta(\mathbf{c}_1) \times \dots \times \theta^{n-1}(\mathbf{c}_1) \simeq \mathbf{c}_1^{1+\mu_1+\dots+\mu_1^{n-1}} \simeq B_K,$$

We have $\mu_1 \neq 1$: if not $1 + \mu_1 + \dots + \mu_1^{n-1} = n \equiv 0 \bmod q$, contradicting the hypothesis $p-1 \not\equiv 0 \bmod q$. Therefore we have simultaneously the two congruences:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{\mu_1^n - 1}{\mu_1 - 1} \equiv 0 \bmod q,\\
&\frac{\mu_1^{q-1} - 1}{\mu_1 - 1} \equiv 0 \bmod q,
\end{aligned}$$

which implies that $Gcd(n, q-1) \neq 1$ and achieves the proof. □

We give an application example for the primes q dividing the relative class number h^-. We use the table of relative class numbers in Washington [68] p 413. Let $p = 239$, with $\frac{p-1}{2} = 69$. Then $p-1 = 2 \times 7 \times 17$. For the prime divisors q of h^- with $p-1 \not\equiv 0 \bmod q$:

- $q - 1 = 511122 \Rightarrow Gcd(\frac{p-1}{2}, q-1) = 17$.
- $q - 1 = 14136486 \Rightarrow Gcd(\frac{p-1}{2}, q-1) = 7 \times 17$.
- $q - 1 = 123373184788 \Rightarrow Gcd(\frac{p-1}{2}, q-1) = 7 \times 17$.

- $q-1 = 22497399987891136953078 \Rightarrow Gcd(\frac{p-1}{2}, q-1) = 7 \times 17$.

Corollary 2.20. **** Let p be an odd prime. Let g be an odd prime divisor of $p-1$. Let L be the (cyclic) intermediate field $\mathbb{Q} \subset L \subset \mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$, $\quad [L:\mathbb{Q}] = g$. Let q be a prime divisor of the class number h_L of the field L. If $q \neq g$ then $q \equiv 1 \mod g$.*

Proof. Let B be the ring of integers of L. Let $\theta : L \rightarrow L$ be a $\mathbb{Q}$-isomorphism of L. There exists an ideal $\mathbf{c}$ of L such that $\mathbf{c}^q \simeq B$, $\quad \mathbf{c} \not\simeq B$, $\quad \mathbf{c}^{\theta-\mu} \simeq B$ for some $\mu \in \{\mu_1, \dots, \mu_{r_q}\}$. We get

$$N_{L/\mathbb{Q}}(\mathbf{c}) = \mathbf{c}^{1+\theta+\dots+\theta^{g-1}} \simeq \mathbf{c}^{1+\mu+\dots+\mu^{g-1}} \simeq B.$$

If $\mu = 1$ then $\mathbf{c}^g \simeq B$ and $q|g$ so $q = g$, contradicting hypothesis. If $\mu \neq 1$ then $\mu^g - 1 \equiv 0 \mod q$, so $q \equiv 1 \mod g$. ☐

Remark: In this particular situation, our result improves Masley [32] corollary 3.5 p 287 and Washington [68] theorem 10.8 p 188, results which assert only that if $q \neq g$ then $q^f \equiv 1 \mod g$, where $f \geq 1$ is a divisor of the q-rank of the q-class group of L. We assert more : in this particular case: $q \equiv 1 \mod g$.

2.4.8 An explicit formula for the relative class number h^- of $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$

In this paragraph, we give an explicit formula very straightforward for the relative class number h^- of the cyclotomic number field $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$. Recall the usual notation, for $a \in \mathbb{R}^+$, then $[a] \in \mathbb{N}$ is the integer part of a and for $b \in \mathbb{R}$ and $|b|$ is the absolute value of b.

Theorem 2.21. **** An explicit formula for the relative class number h^- of $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$*

Let p be an odd prime. Let $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$ be the p-cyclotomic number field. Let h^- be the relative class number of $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$. Let u be a primitive root $\mod p$. Let $u_i = u^i \mod p$, $\quad 1 \leq u_i \leq p-1$, $\quad i = 1, \dots, p-1$. Let $\delta_{a,i}$, $\quad a = 1, \dots, \frac{p-1}{2}$, $\quad i = 1, \dots, \frac{p-1}{2}$, given by the relation

$$\delta_{a,i} = ([\frac{(a+1) \times u_i}{p}] - [\frac{a \times u_i}{p}]) - ([\frac{(a+1) \times (p-u_i)}{p}] - [\frac{a \times (p-u_i)}{p}]).$$

Then $\delta_{a,i} \in \mathbb{N}$, $\quad \delta_{a,i} \in \{-1, 1\}$. Let Δ be the determinant with $\frac{p-1}{2}$ rows and $\frac{p-1}{2}$ columns given by:

$$\Delta = \begin{vmatrix} \delta_{1,1} & \delta_{1,2} & \dots & \delta_{1,(p-1)/2} \\ \delta_{2,1} & \delta_{2,2} & \dots & \delta_{2,(p-1)/2)} \\ \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots \\ \delta_{(p-1)/2,1} & \delta_{(p-1)/2,2} & \dots & \delta_{(p-1)/2,(p-1)/2} \end{vmatrix}$$

Then h^- is explicitly given by the relation

$$h^- = 2^{(p-3)/2} \times |\Delta|. \tag{34}$$

Proof. At the moment, we have no proof, but a numerical evidence, easily verified with a MAPLE program. For instance, for the regular prime $p = 97$ we find $h^- = 577 \times 3457 \times 206209$ in accordance with Washington [68] p 413, for the regular prime $p = 30$ we find $h^- = 3^2$ in accordance with Washington, for the irregular prime $p = 157$, we find $h^- = 5 \times 13^2 \times 157^2 \times 1093 \times 1873 \times 418861 \times 3148601$ and for the irregular prime 37 we find $h^- = 37$, always in accordance with Washington. $\square$

Remarks :

- In comparison, the Maillet determinant M_p formula is given by

  $$M_p = |(i \times (j^{-1} \bmod p) \bmod p|_{i,j=1,\dots,(p-1)/2},$$
  $$h^- = p^{-(p-3)/2} \times M_p,$$

  see for instance Ribenboim [39] formula (6.2) p 132 or Lang [26] theorem 7.1 p 92. Our formula has the interest, compared to Maillet determinant:
  - It does not contain extraneous p power factor.
  - The term $\delta_{ij} \in \{-1, 1\}$ is simpler than the term $a_{ij} = (i \times (j^{-1} \bmod p)) \bmod p, \quad 1 \leq a_{ij} \leq p - 1$.
- For a formula for the relative class number h^- without extraneous p-power, see also Lehmer [29] theorem 4 p 604, derived of a result of Carlitz-Olson.
- For a determinant formula without extraneous p-power see also the simplest form of Masley [32] theorem 1.2 p 275

  $$h^- = |[i * j/p] - [(i-1) * j/p]|_{i,j=3,4,\dots(p-1)/2}, \quad p > 5.$$

- Observe that if the p-rank of the matrix $(\delta_{a,i})_{a=1,\dots,(p-1)/2, \quad i=1,\dots,(p-1)/2}$, is greater than $\frac{p-1}{2} - \sqrt{p} + 1$, then first case of FLT holds for p.
- The proof of this result could be in relation with results on singular integers from Inkeri and Fueter explained in subsection 14.3.4 p. 155 of this monograph.

3 On structure of the unit group $F = \mathbb{Z}[\zeta + \zeta^{-1}]^*/(\mathbb{Z}[\zeta + \zeta^{-1}]^*)^p$

Let us consider the results obtained in subsection 2.4.5 p.26 for the action of $Gal(\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)/\mathbb{Q})$ on C_p^-. In the present subsection, we assert that this approach can be partially translated *mutatis mutandis* to the study of the group

$$F = \mathbb{Z}[\zeta + \zeta^{-1}]^*/(\mathbb{Z}[\zeta + \zeta^{-1}]^*)^p.$$

This section contains:

1. a subsection where the π-adic congruences obtained for p-class group C_p are generalized to unit group $F = \mathbb{Z}[\zeta + \zeta^{-1}]^*/(\mathbb{Z}[\zeta + \zeta^{-1}]^*)^p$.
2. a subsection linking our results with results on cyclotomic units in Washington [68].
3. a subsection with definition and study of structure of *singular group*.

3.1 On structure of unit group $F = \mathbb{Z}[\zeta + \zeta^{-1}]^*/(\mathbb{Z}[\zeta + \zeta^{-1}]^*)^p$

- When $h^- \equiv 0 \bmod p$, from Hilbert class field theory, there exists *primary* units $\eta \in \mathbb{Z}[\zeta + \zeta^{-1}]^*$, so such that

  $$\begin{aligned} &\eta \equiv d^p \bmod p, \quad d \in \mathbb{Z}, \quad d \not\equiv 0, \\ &\sigma(\eta) = \eta^{\mu} \times \varepsilon^p, \quad \varepsilon \in \mathbb{Z}[\zeta + \eta^{-1}]^*, \end{aligned} \tag{35}$$

  see the independant forward reference on Hilbert class field, section 4 p. 51.

- The group $\mathbb{Z}[\zeta + \zeta^{-1}]^*$ is a free group of rank $\frac{p-3}{2}$. For all $\eta \in \mathbb{Z}[\zeta + \zeta^{-1}]^*$

  $$\eta \times \sigma(\eta) \times \cdots \times \sigma^{(p-3)/2}(\eta) = \pm 1.$$

  Therefore, for each unit $\eta \in \mathbb{Z}[\zeta + \zeta^{-1}]^*$, there exists a **minimal** $r_\eta \in \mathbb{N}, \quad r_\eta \leq \frac{p-3}{2}$, such that

  $$\begin{aligned} &\eta \times \sigma(\eta)^{l_1} \times \cdots \times \sigma^{r_\eta}(\eta)^{l_{r_\eta}} = \varepsilon^p, \quad \varepsilon \in \mathbb{Z}[\zeta + \zeta^{-1}]^*, \\ &0 \leq l_i \leq p-1, \quad i = 1, \dots, r_\eta, \quad l_{r_\eta} \neq 0. \end{aligned} \tag{36}$$

- Let us define an equivalence on units of $\mathbb{Z}[\zeta + \zeta^{-1}]^*$: $\eta, \eta' \in \mathbb{Z}[\zeta + \zeta^{-1}]^*$ are said equivalent if there exists $\varepsilon \in \mathbb{Z}[\zeta + \zeta^{-1}]^*$ such that $\eta' = \eta \times \varepsilon^p$. Let us denote $E(\eta)$ the equivalence class of η.

- We have $E(\eta_a \times \eta_b) = E(\eta_a) \times E(\eta_b)$; the set of class $E(\eta)$ is a group. The group $< E(\eta) >$ generated by $E(\eta)$ is cyclic of order p.

- Observe that this equivalence is consistent with conjugation $E(\sigma(\eta)) = \sigma(E(\eta))$.

- The group $F = \mathbb{Z}[\zeta + \zeta^{-1}]^*/(\mathbb{Z}[\zeta + \zeta^{-1}]^*)^p$ so defined is a group of rank $\frac{p-3}{2}$, see for instance Ribenboim [39] p 184 line 14.

- Similarly to relation (11) p.23, there exists $\eta \in \mathbb{Z}[\zeta + \zeta^{-1}]^*$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} & E(\eta) = E(\eta_1) \times \cdots \times E(\eta_{(p-3)/2}), \\ & E(\sigma(\eta_i)) = E(\eta_i^{\mu_i}), \quad i = 1, \ldots, \frac{p-3}{2}, \\ & \mu_i \in \mathbb{N}, \quad 1 < \mu_i \leq p-1, \\ & F =< E(\eta_1) > \oplus \cdots \oplus < E(\eta_{(p-3)/2}) >, \end{aligned} \tag{37}$$

where F is seen as a $\mathbf{F}_p[G]$-module of dimension $\frac{p-3}{2}$.

- For each unit η, there is a minimal polynomial $P_{r_\eta}(V) = \prod_{i=1}^{r_\eta}(V - \mu_i)$ where $r_\eta \leq \frac{p-3}{2}$, such that

$$\begin{aligned} & E(\eta)^{P_{r_\eta}(\sigma)} = E(1), \\ & 1 \leq i < j \leq r_\eta \Rightarrow \mu_i \neq \mu_j. \end{aligned} \tag{38}$$

- Let $\beta \in \mathbb{Z}[\zeta + \zeta^{-1}]^*$. Observe that if $E(\beta) = E(\sigma(\beta))$ then $E(\sigma^2(\beta)) = E(\beta)$ and so $E(1) = E(\beta^{p-1})$ and $E(\beta) = 1$, that's why $1 < \mu_i \leq p-1, \quad i = 1, \ldots, \frac{p-3}{2}$, in relation (37) p. 44.

- Recall that the unit $\beta \in \mathbb{Z}[\zeta + \zeta^{-1}]^*$ is said primary if $\beta \equiv b^p \mod \pi^{p+1}, \quad b \in \mathbb{Z}$.

Lemma 3.1. *Let $\beta \in \mathbb{Z}[\zeta + \zeta^{-1}]^* - (\mathbb{Z}[\zeta + \zeta^{-1}]^*)^p$. Then the minimal polynomial $P_{r_\beta}(V)$ is of the form*

$$P_{r_\beta}(V) = \prod_{i=1}^{r_\beta}(V - u_{2m_i}), \quad 1 \leq m_i \leq \frac{p-1}{2}, \quad r_\beta > 0.$$

Proof. There exists $\eta_1 \in \mathbb{Z}[\zeta + \zeta^{-1}]^*, \quad E(\eta_1) \neq E(1)$, with $E(\eta_1)^{\sigma - \mu_1} = E(1)$. Suppose that $\mu_1^{(p-1)/2} = -1$ and search for a contradiction: we have $E(\eta_1)^{\sigma - \mu_1} = E(1)$, therefore $E(\eta_1)^{\sigma^{(p-1)/2} - \mu_1^{(p-1)/2}} = E(1)$; but, from $\eta_1 \in \mathbb{Z}[\zeta + \zeta^{-1}]^*$, we get $\eta_1^{\sigma^{(p-1)/2}} = \eta_1$ and so $E(\eta_1)^{1 - \mu_1^{(p-1)/2}} = E(1)$, or $E(\eta_1)^2 = E(1)$, so $E(\eta_1)^2$ is of rank null and therefore $E(\eta_1) = E(\eta_1^2)^{(p+1)/2}$ is also of rank null, contradiction. The same for $\mu_i, \quad i = 1, \ldots, r_\beta$. □

The results on structure of relative p-class group C_p^- of subsection 2.4.5 p. 26 can be translated to some results on structure of the group F: from $\eta_i^{p-1} \equiv 1 \bmod \pi$ and from $< E(\eta_i^{p-1}) >=< E(\eta_i) >$, we can always, without loss of generality, choose the determination η_i such that $\eta_i \equiv 1 \bmod \pi$. We have proved that

$$\begin{aligned}&\eta_i \equiv 1 \bmod \pi,\\ &\sigma(\eta_i) \equiv \eta_i^{\mu_i} \bmod \pi^{p+1}.\end{aligned} \tag{39}$$

Then, starting of this relation (39), similarly to lemma 2.9 p. 28 we get:

Theorem 3.2. **** On structure of unit group $F = \mathbb{Z}[\zeta+\zeta^{-1}]^*/(\mathbb{Z}[\zeta+\zeta^{-1}]^*)^p$*

There exists a fundamental system of units η_i, $i = 1, \dots, \frac{p-3}{2}$, of the group $F = \mathbb{Z}[\zeta+\zeta^{-1}]^*/(\mathbb{Z}[\zeta+\zeta^{-1}]^*)^p$ verifying the relations:

$$\begin{aligned}&\eta_i \in \mathbb{Z}[\zeta+\zeta^{-1}]^*, \quad i = 1, \dots, \frac{p-3}{2},\\ &\sigma(\eta_i) = \eta_i^{\mu_i} \times \varepsilon_i^p, \quad \mu_i \in \mathbf{F}_p^*, \quad \varepsilon_i \in \mathbb{Z}[\zeta+\zeta^{-1}]^*, \quad i = 1, \dots, \frac{p-3}{2},\\ &\eta_i \equiv 1 \ mod\ \pi^{2m_i}, \quad \mu_i = u_{2m_i}, \quad i = 1, \dots, \frac{p-3}{2},\\ &\sigma(\eta_i) \equiv \eta_i^{\mu_i} \ mod\ \pi^{p+1}, \quad i = 1, \dots, \frac{p-3}{2}.\end{aligned} \tag{40}$$

At this point, we are in the situation to apply the same π-adic theory to group of units $F = \mathbb{Z}[\zeta+\zeta^{-1}]^*/(\mathbb{Z}[\zeta+\zeta^{-1}]^*)^p$ than to relative p-class group C_p^- in subsection 2.4.5 p. 26.

Similarly to decomposition of components of C_p^1 in singular primary and singular not primary components, the rank $\frac{p-3}{2}$ of F has two components ρ_1 and $\frac{p-3}{2} - \rho_1$ where ρ_1 corresponds to the maximal number of independant units η_i primary and $\rho_2 = \frac{p-3}{2} - \rho_1$ to the units η_i not primary. The unit indexation in the sequel of this subsection is :

1. primary units η_i for $i = 1, \dots, \rho_1$,
2. not primary units η_i for $i = \rho_1 + 1, \dots, \frac{p-3}{2}$.

Remarks:

- Similarly to results obtained for group C_p^-,
    - else $\pi^{2m_i} \| \eta_i - 1$ and η_i is not singular primary
    - else $\eta_i \equiv 1 \bmod \pi^p$ and η_i is singular primary. We say more in that case: similarly to Denes result see [6] [7] [8] and Ribenboim [39] (8D) p. 192,

$$\pi^{2m_i+a(p-1)} \| \eta_i - 1, \quad a \in \mathbb{N} - \{0\}. \tag{41}$$

- The units $\eta_i^j, \quad j=1,\dots,p-1$, verify similarly the relation (40) p. 45. We chose the determination of η_i such that $C_{2m}(1,0) \equiv 1 \bmod p$: see for the definition of $C_{2m}(1,0)$ and the detail of similar discussion for C_p^1 in second remark following lemma 2.9 p. 28.

The next lemma for the unit group $\mathbb{Z}[\zeta+\zeta^{-1}]^*$ is the translation of similar lemma 2.11 p. 32 for the relative p-class group C_p^-.

Lemma 3.3. *Let $\eta_i, \quad i=1,\dots,\frac{p-3}{2}$, defined in relation (40) p. 45. If η_i is not primary then*

$$\eta_i \equiv 1+V_i(\mu_i) \ mod\ \pi^{p-1}, \quad \mu_i = u_{2m_i} \quad V_i(\mu_i) \in \mathbb{Z}[\zeta],$$

where $V_i(\mu_i)$ mod p depends only on μ_i.

The next lemma for the unit group $\mathbb{Z}[\zeta+\zeta^{-1}]^*$ is the translation of similar lemma 2.12 p. 32 for the relative p-class group C_p^-.

Lemma 3.4. **** Let η_1,η_2 defined by relation (40) p. 45. If $\mu_1=\mu_2$ then η_1 and η_2 are primary.*

The group $F=\mathbb{Z}[\zeta+\zeta^{-1}]^*/(\mathbb{Z}[\zeta+\zeta^{-1}]^*)^p$ is the direct sum $F=F_1\oplus F_2$ of the subgroup F_1 with ρ_1 primary units (p-rank ρ_1 of F_1) and of the subgroup F_2 with $\rho_2=\frac{p-3}{2}-\rho_1$ fundamental not primary units (p-rank ρ_2 of F_2). Observe that ρ_1 can be seen also as the maximal number of independant primary units in F.

Theorem 3.5. **** On structure of unit group $F=\mathbb{Z}[\zeta+\zeta^{-1}]^*/(\mathbb{Z}[\zeta+\zeta^{-1}]^*)^p$ Let r_p^- be the relative p-class group of $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$. Let r_p^+ be the p-class group of $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta+\zeta^{-1})$. Let ρ_1 be the number of independant primary units of F. Then*

$$\rho_1 = r_p^-. \tag{42}$$

Proof. We apply Hilbert class field structure theorems 5.4 p. 65 and 5.5 p. 66: There are r_p^+ independant unramified cyclic extensions

$$\mathbb{Q}(\zeta,\omega_i)/\mathbb{Q}(\zeta), \quad \omega_i^p \in \mathbb{Z}[\zeta+\zeta^{-1}]-\mathbb{Z}[\zeta+\zeta^{-1}]^* \quad i=1,\dots,r_p^+$$

and $r_p-r_p^+=r_p^-$ independant unramified cyclic extensions

$$\mathbb{Q}(\zeta,\omega_i)/\mathbb{Q}(\zeta), \quad \omega_i^p \in \mathbb{Z}[\zeta+\zeta^{-1}]^*, \quad i=r_p^++1,\dots,r_p.$$

□

3.2 The case $\mu = u_{2m}, \quad 2m > \frac{p-1}{2}$

In the next theorem we shall investigate more deeply the consequences of the congruence $\eta_i \equiv 1 \bmod \pi^{2m_i}$ when $2m_i > \frac{p-1}{2}$. We give an explicit congruence formula in that case. The next theorem for the unit group $\mathbb{Z}[\zeta+\zeta^{-1}]^*$ is the translation of similar theorem 2.18 p. 38 for the relative p-class group C_p^-.

Theorem 3.6. **** Let $\mu_i = u_{2m_i}, \quad p-3 \geq 2m_i > \frac{p-1}{2}$, corresponding to $\eta_i \in \mathbb{Z}[\zeta+\zeta^{-1}]^*$ defined in relation (40) p. 45, so $\sigma(\eta_i) \equiv \eta_i^{\mu_i}$ mod π^{p+1}. Then η_i verifies the explicit formula:*

$$\eta_i \equiv 1 - \frac{\gamma_{p-3}}{\mu-1} \times (\zeta + \mu^{-1}\zeta^{u} + \cdots + \mu^{-(p-2)}\zeta^{u_{p-2}}) \ \textit{mod}\ \pi^{p-1}, \quad \gamma_{p-3} \in \mathbb{Z}. \tag{43}$$

3.3 Connection with set of units E_{2i} of Washington

In paragraph 8.3 of [68], Washington defines p. 155 and studies the units

$$E_{2i} =_{def} \prod_{a=1}^{p-1} (\zeta^{(1-u)/2} \times \frac{1-\zeta^u}{1-\zeta})^{a^{2i}\tau_a^{-1}}, \quad i = 1, \dots, \frac{p-3}{2},$$

where τ_a is the $\mathbb{Q}$-isomorphism of $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta), \quad \tau_a : \zeta \to \zeta^a$. For $a = 1, \dots, p-1$, let j defined by $u_{-j} = a$ with $0 \leq j \leq p-2$. Then $a^{2i} = u_{-2ij} \equiv u_{-2i}^j$ mod p and $\tau_a : \zeta \to \zeta^{u_{-j}}$ verifies $\tau_a = \sigma^{-j}$ and $\tau_a^{-1} = \sigma^j$. Therefore

$$E_{2i} \equiv \prod_{j=0}^{p-2} (\zeta^{(1-u)/2} \times \frac{1-\zeta^u}{1-\zeta})^{u_{-2i}^j \sigma^j} \bmod (\mathbb{Z}[\zeta+\zeta^{-1}]^*)^p,$$

so

$$E_{2i} \equiv (\zeta^{(1-u)/2} \times \frac{1-\zeta^u}{1-\zeta})^{\sum_{j=0}^{p-2} \sigma^j u_{-2i}^j} \bmod (\mathbb{Z}[\zeta+\zeta^{-1}]^*)^p,$$

also

$$E_{2i}^{\sigma - u_{-2i}} \equiv (\zeta^{(1-u)/2} \times \frac{1-\zeta^u}{1-\zeta})^{(\sigma u_{-2i})^{p-1}-1} \bmod (\mathbb{Z}[\zeta+\zeta^{-1}]^*)^p,$$

and finally

$$\sigma(E_{2i}) = E_{2i}^{u_{-2i}} \times \varepsilon^p, \quad \varepsilon \in \mathbb{Z}[\zeta+\zeta^{-1}]^*. \tag{44}$$

Recall that r_p^+ is the rank of the p-class group C_p^+ of $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta+\zeta^{-1})$.

Theorem 3.7. *The units* E_{2i}, $i = 1, \dots, \frac{p-3}{2}$, *defined in Washington [68] p. 155 and the set* F *of units* η_i, $i = 1, \dots, \frac{p-3}{2}$, *defined in theorem 3.2 p. 45 of this monograph are connected, with a certain ordering of index i, by:*

$$E_{2i} = \eta_i^p, \quad i = 1, \dots, r_p^+,$$
$$E_{2i} = \eta_i, \quad i = r_p^+ + 1, \dots, \frac{p-3}{2},$$

Proof. See relation (44) p.47, theorem 3.2 p. 45 and Wahington [68] theorem 8.16 p. 156. □

Remark: this theorem 3.7, with theorem 3.2 p. 45, allows to give a precise π-adic description of units E_{2i} defined in Washington.

3.4 On structure of Singular Group

The singular numbers $\gamma \in \mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$ are the numbers verifying $\gamma\mathbb{Z}[\zeta] = \mathbf{c}^p$ where $\mathbf{c}$ is an ideal of $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$. With this definition, the units of $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$ are singular numbers. The set of singular numbers is a multiplicative subgroup of $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$. The interest of this group is that it includes structure properties of p-class group C_p of $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$ and of unit group $\mathbb{Z}[\zeta+\zeta^{-1}]^*$ in a same structure. Some definitions and results on the groups $\mathbb{Z}[\zeta+\zeta^{-1}]^*$ and C_p^* are reminded in this paragraph:

- Recall that $\pi = (\zeta - 1)\mathbb{Z}[\zeta]$.
- Recall that $\alpha \in \mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$ coprime with π is said *singular* if $\alpha\mathbb{Z}[\zeta] = \mathbf{a}^p$ where $\mathbf{a}$ is an ideal of the field $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$, see for instance Ribenboim [39] paragraph 4. p 170.
- The set of singular numbers is a multiplicative group denoted W in this subsection.
- Two singular numbers α, β are said here equivalent if $\alpha \equiv \beta \bmod \pi^p$. This is clearly an equivalence relation. Let us consider the group $\Omega = W \bmod \pi^p$ called in this subsection the *singular group.* As an immediate consequence, observe that if $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$ are coprime with π and if α is singular then $\alpha\beta^p$ is singular and α and $\alpha\beta^p$ are equivalent.
- A singular number α is said primary if there exists $a \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $\alpha \equiv a^p \bmod \pi^p$. Therefore α and a^p are equivalent.
- We have defined the group $F = \mathbb{Z}[\zeta+\zeta^{-1}]^*/(\mathbb{Z}[\zeta+\zeta^{-1}]^*)^p$ with $F = F_1 \oplus F_2$ where F_1 has $\rho_1 = r_p^-$ fundamental primary units η_i, $i = 1, \dots r_p^-$ (p-rank of F_1) and F_2 has $\rho_2 = \frac{p-3}{2} - r_p^-$ fundamental not primary units η_i, $i = r_p^- + 1, \dots, \frac{p-3}{2} - r_p^-$.

- Here, recall some definitions dealing of p-class group:
  - Let C_p be the p-class group of $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$, C_p^1 be the subgroup of C_p whose elements are of order 1 or p.
  - Let r_p be the p-rank of C_p, let r_p^+ be the p-rank of C_p^+ and r_p^- be the relative p-rank of C_p^-. Let us consider the ideals $\mathbf{b}$ defined in relation (11) p.23:

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\mathbf{b} = \mathbf{b}_1 \times \cdots \times \mathbf{b}_{r_p^-} \times \mathbf{b}_{r_p^-+1} \times \cdots \times \mathbf{b}_{r_p},\\
&C_p^1 = \oplus_{i=1}^{r_p} < Cl(\mathbf{b}_i) >,\\
&\mathbf{b}_i^p \simeq \mathbb{Z}[\zeta], \quad \mathbf{b}_i \not\simeq \mathbb{Z}[\zeta], \quad i = 1, \dots, r_p,\\
&\sigma(\mathbf{b}_i) \simeq \mathbf{b}_i^{\mu_i}, \quad \mu_i \in \mathbf{F}_p^*, \quad i = 1, \dots, r_p,\\
&Cl(\mathbf{b}_i) \in C_p^-, \quad i = 1, \dots, r_p^-,\\
&Cl(\mathbf{b}_i) \in C_p^+, \quad i = r_p^- + 1, \dots, r_p.
\end{aligned} \tag{45}
$$

  - Let $B_i \in \mathbb{Z}[\zeta], \quad i = 1, \dots, r_p$, with $B_i\mathbb{Z}[\zeta] = \mathbf{b}_i^p$ defined in theorem 2.16 p. 36. With the conventions for the index $i = 1, \dots, r_p$, of relation (45) p. 49:
    - $*$ B_i are singular primary integers for $i = 1, \dots, r_p^+$, with $Cl(\mathbf{b}_i) \in C_p^-$. Let Γ_1 be the subgroup of Ω generated by these B_i; its p-rank is r_p^+.
    - $*$ B_i are singular not primary integers for $i = r_p^+ + 1, \dots, r_p^-$, with $Cl(\mathbf{b}_i) \in C_p^-$. Let Γ_2 be the subgroup of Ω generated by these B_i; its p-rank is $r_p^- - r_p^+$.
    - $*$ B_i are singular not primary for $i = r_p^- + 1, \dots, r_p$ with $Cl(\mathbf{b}_i) \in C_p^+$. Let Γ_3 be the subgroup of Ω generated by these B_i; its p-rank is r_p^+.

Theorem 3.8. **** With the previous definitions, the singular group Ω verifies the isomorphism:*

$$\Omega \cong U \oplus F_2 \oplus \Gamma_2 \oplus \Gamma_3, \tag{46}$$

where $U = \{i^p \ mod\ p^2 \mid i = 1, \dots, p-1\}$. The p-rank of Ω is $\frac{p-3}{2}$.

Proof. Let $\alpha \in \mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$, coprime with π. We can always write α in the form

$$\alpha = \mathbf{B}_1 \times \mathbf{B}_2 \times \mathbf{B}_3 \times \mathbf{E}_1 \times \mathbf{E}_2 \times \gamma^p, \quad \gamma \in \mathbb{Q}(\zeta), \quad \gamma\mathbb{Z}[\zeta] + \pi = \mathbb{Z}[\zeta],$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbf{B}_1 = B_1^{\nu_1}\dots B_i^{\nu_i}\dots B_{r_p^+}^{\nu_{r_p^+}}, \quad i=1,\dots,r_p^+,\\
&\mathbf{B}_2 = B_{r_p^++1}^{\nu_{r_p^++1}}\dots B_i^{\nu_i}\dots B_{r_p^-}^{\nu_{r_p^-}}, \quad i=r_p^++1,\dots,r_p^-,\\
&\mathbf{B}_3 = B_{r_p^-+1}^{\nu_{r_p^-+1}}\dots B_i^{\nu_i}\dots B_{r_p}^{\nu_{r_p}}, \quad i=r_p^-,\dots,r_p,\\
&\mathbf{E}_1 = \eta_1^{\nu'_1}\dots\eta_j^{\nu'_j}\dots\eta_{\rho_1}^{\nu'_{\rho_1}}, \quad j=1,\dots,r_p^-,\\
&\mathbf{E}_2 = \eta_{\rho_1+1}^{\nu_{\rho_1+1}}\dots\eta_j^{\nu'_j}\dots\eta_{(p-3)/2}^{\nu'_{(p-3)/2}}, \quad j=r_p^-+1,\dots,\frac{p-3}{2},
\end{aligned}\tag{47}$$

where

1. $\mathbf{B}_1$ is a product of r_p^+ independant singular primary numbers (not units),
2. $\mathbf{B}_2$ is a product of $r_p^- - r_p^+$ independant singular not primary numbers (not units),
3. $\mathbf{B}_3$ is a product of r_p^+ independant singular not primary numbers (not units),
4. $\mathbf{E}_1$ is a product of r_p^- independant singular primary units,
5. $\mathbf{E}_2$ is a product of $\frac{p-3}{2} - r_p^-$ independant singular not primary units.

If B is a singular primary number then $B \equiv b^p \mod \pi^p, \quad b \in \mathbb{Z}, \quad 1 \le b \le p-1$. Therefore from previous relations (47) p. 50, we derive that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\alpha \equiv a^p \times \mathbf{B}_2 \times \mathbf{B}_3 \times \mathbf{E}_2 \mod \pi^p,\\
&a \in \mathbb{Z}, \quad 1 \le a \le p-1,\\
&\mathbf{B}_2 = B_{r_p^++1}^{\nu_{r_p^++1}}\dots B_i^{\nu_i}\dots B_{r_p^-}^{\nu_{r_p^-}}, \quad i=r_p^++1,\dots,r_p^-,\\
&\mathbf{B}_3 = B_{r_p^-+1}^{\nu_{r_p^-+1}}\dots B_i^{\nu_i}\dots B_{r_p}^{\nu_{r_p}}, \quad i=r_p^-+1,\dots,r_p,\\
&\mathbf{E}_2 = \eta_{\rho_1+1}^{\nu_{\rho_1+1}}\dots\eta_j^{\nu'_j}\dots\eta_{(p-3)/2}^{\nu'_{(p-3)/2}}, \quad j=r_p^-+1,\dots,\frac{p-3}{2}.
\end{aligned}\tag{48}$$

The set of integers a^p generate the cyclic group $U = \{i^p \mod p^2 \mid i=1,\dots,p-1\}$ of order $p-1$. The set of singular numbers $\mathbf{B}_2$ generate the p-group Γ_2 of p-rank $r_p^- - r_p^+$. The set of singular numbers $\mathbf{B}_3$ generate the p-group Γ_3 of p-rank r_p^+. The units $\mathbf{E}_2$ generate the group F_2 of p-rank $\frac{p-3}{2} - r_p^-$. The p-rank of Ω is $(r_p^- - r_p^+) + r_p^+ + (\frac{p-3}{2} - r_p^-) = \frac{p-3}{2}$. □

4 On Hilbert class field of $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$

This section deals of properties of the structure of the p-class group C_p of $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$ deduced of the theory of the Hilbert class field of the cyclotomic field $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$.

4.1 Some definitions and properties of Hilbert class field of $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$

In this subsection, we define the p-Hilbert class field H of $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$. See, for some notations, Washington [68], p 165, chapter 8 p 143 and also Ribenboim [39] chapter 6. p 178.

4.1.1 Definitions and preliminary results

- Recall that u is a primitive root $\bmod p$.
- Recall that σ is the $\mathbb{Q}$-isomorphism of $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$ defined by $\sigma : \zeta \rightarrow \zeta^u$ and that $G = Gal(\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)/\mathbb{Q})$.
- Let $\tau_a : \zeta \rightarrow \zeta^a, \quad a \in \mathbb{N}$, be a $\mathbb{Q}$-isomorphism of the extension $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)/\mathbb{Q}$ defined in an other way.
- Recall that r_p is the rank of the p-class group C_p of $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$. Let r_p^+ be the rank of the class group C_p^+ of $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta+\zeta^{-1})/\mathbb{Q}$. Let r_p^- be the rank of the relative class group $C_p^- = C_p/C_p^+$ of $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)/\mathbb{Q}$.
- Let C_p^1 be the subgroup of C_p whose elements are of order 1 or p. The order of C_p^1 is p^{r_p}.
- Let $a \in \mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$; recall that a is said singular if $a\mathbb{Z}[\zeta] = \mathbf{a}^p$ for some ideal $\mathbf{a}$ of $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$ and is said singular primary if a is singular and $a \equiv a_1^p \bmod \pi^p, \quad a_1 \in \mathbb{Z}, \quad a_1 \not\equiv 0 \bmod p$. Recall that a unit $\eta \in \mathbb{Z}[\zeta+\zeta^{-1}]^*$ is said primary if $\eta \equiv b^p \bmod \pi^p, \quad b \in \mathbb{Z}, \quad 1 \leq b \leq p-1$.
- We have seen in relation (11) p. 23 that there exists ideals $\mathbf{b}$ of $\mathbb{Z}[\zeta]$ verifying the relations

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbf{b} \simeq \mathbf{b}_1 \times \mathbf{b}_2 \times \cdots \times \mathbf{b}_{r_p},\\
&\mathbf{b}_i \not\simeq \mathbb{Z}[\zeta], \quad \mathbf{b}_i^p \simeq \mathbb{Z}[\zeta],\\
(49)\qquad &\sigma(\mathbf{b}_i) \simeq \mathbf{b}_i^{\mu_i}, \quad \mu_i \in \mathbf{F}_p^*, \quad i = 1, \dots, r_p,\\
&Cl(\mathbf{b}_i) \in C_p^-, \quad i = 1, \dots, r_p^-,\\
&Cl(\mathbf{b}_i) \in C_p^+, \quad i = r_p^- + 1, \dots, r_p,
\end{aligned}$$

- Seen as a $\mathbf{F}_p[G]$ module, we have
$$C_p^1 = \oplus_{i=1}^{r_p} < Cl(\mathbf{b}_i) > .$$

- With the meaning of index $i = 1, \dots, r_p$, of relation (49) above, we have proved in theorem 2.16 p. 36 that there exists $B_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, r_p$, verifying
$$\begin{aligned} &B_i \in \mathbb{Z}[\zeta], \quad \pi^p | B_i - 1, \quad \mu_i = u_{2m_i+1}, \quad i = 1, \dots, n^-, \\ &B_i \in \mathbb{Z}[\zeta], \quad \pi^{2m_i+1} \| B_i - 1, \quad \mu_i = u_{2m_i+1}, \quad i = n^- + 1, \dots, r_p^-, \\ &B_i \mathbb{Z}[\zeta] = \mathbf{b}_i^p, \quad i = 1, \dots, r_p^-, \\ &B_i \overline{B_i} = \beta_i^p, \quad i = 1, \dots, r_p^-. \end{aligned} \tag{50}$$
and
$$\begin{aligned} &B_i \in \mathbb{Z}[\zeta + \zeta^{-1}], \quad \pi^p | B_i - 1, \quad \mu_i = u_{2m_i}, \quad i = r_p^- + 1, \dots, n^+, \\ &B_i \in \mathbb{Z}[\zeta + \zeta^{-1}], \quad \pi^{2m_i} \| B_i - 1, \quad \mu_i = u_{2m_i}, \quad i = n^+ + 1, \dots, r_p, \\ &B_i \mathbb{Z}[\zeta + \zeta^{-1}] = \mathbf{b}_i^p, \quad i = r_p^- + 1, \dots, r_p, \end{aligned} \tag{51}$$
The values n^- and n^+ shall be determined in the sequel: we shall prove that $n^- = r_p^+$ in theorem 4.2 p. 55 and that $n^+ = 0$ in remark following theorem 5.4 p. 65.

- Let $\mathbf{M}$ be a set of r_p independant unramified cyclic extensions $K_i = \mathbb{Q}(\zeta, \omega_i)/\mathbb{Q}(\zeta), \quad i = 1, \dots, r_p$, with $K_i \subset H, \quad [K_i : \mathbb{Q}(\zeta)] = p$.

- ω_i so introduced, we call in this monograph *p-elementary* Hilbert class field of $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$ the unramified extension $H/\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$:
$$\begin{aligned} &H = \mathbb{Q}(\zeta, \omega_1, \dots, \omega_{r_p})/\mathbb{Q}(\zeta), \\ &\omega_i^p = F_i, \quad F_i \in \mathbb{Z}[\zeta], \quad F_i \notin \mathbb{Z}[\zeta]^p, \quad i = 1, \dots, r_p, \\ &F_i \equiv c_i^p \bmod \pi^{p+1}, \quad i = 1, \dots, r_p, \\ &[H : \mathbb{Q}(\zeta)] = p^{r_p}. \end{aligned} \tag{52}$$

- Observe that the principal prime π splits totally in Hilbert class field, so $F_i \equiv c_i^p \bmod \pi^{p+1}$, see for instance Ribenboim p 168 case III. Observe that $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta, F_i^{1/p}) = \mathbb{Q}(\zeta, (F_i \times \alpha^p)^{1/p}), \quad \alpha \in \mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$, so it is always possible to assume F_i to be in $\mathbb{Z}[\zeta]$.

- Let us examine the set $\mathbf{M}$ of unramified extensions $M_i = \mathbb{Q}(\zeta, \omega_i)/\mathbb{Q}(\zeta), \quad i = 1, \dots, r_p$:

- From Washington [68] exercise 9.1 (a) p 182, M_i unramified implies that $F_i\mathbb{Z}[\zeta] = \mathbf{a}_i^p$ for some ideal $\mathbf{a}_i$ of $\mathbb{Z}[\zeta]$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathbf{a}_i \simeq \mathbf{b}_1^{\nu_{1,i}} \dots \mathbf{b}_{r_p}^{\nu_{r_p},i},\\ &\nu_{j,i} \in \mathbb{N}, \quad 0 \le \nu_{i,j} \le p-1, \quad i,j = 1,\dots,r_p.\end{aligned}$$

  and so

$$\begin{aligned}&F_i \equiv c \times B_1^{\nu_{1,i}} \dots B_{r_p}^{\nu_{r_p},i} \bmod \pi^p,\\ &c \in \mathbb{N}, \quad 1 \le c \le p-1.\end{aligned}$$

- From F_i singular primary for $i = 1,\dots,r_p$ and from congruences in relations (50) and (51), we get

$$\begin{aligned}&\nu_{j,i} \equiv 0 \bmod p, \quad j = n^- + 1,\dots,r_p^-, \quad i = 1,\dots,r_p,\\ &\nu_{j,i} \equiv 0 \bmod p, \quad j = r_p^- + n^+ + 1,\dots,r_p, \quad i = 1,\dots,r_p.\end{aligned}$$

  So we can choose the set $\mathbf{M}$ of r_p independant unramified extensions such that

$$\begin{aligned}&F_i = B_i, \quad i = 1,\dots,n^-,\\ &F_i = B_i, \quad i = r_p^- + 1,\dots,r_p^- + n^+.\end{aligned} \tag{53}$$

  and thus

$$\begin{aligned}&F_i \in \mathbb{Z}[\zeta+\zeta^{-1}]^*, \quad i = n^- + 1,\dots,r_p^-,\\ &F_i \in \mathbb{Z}[\zeta+\zeta^{-1}]^*, \quad i = r_p^- + n^+ + 1,\dots,r_p.\end{aligned} \tag{54}$$

- 1. To each subgroup V_i of order p of the p-class group C_p corresponds **one** unramified extension $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta,\Omega)/\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$, where Ω can be written in form $\Omega = \omega_1^{\alpha_1}\omega_2^{\alpha_2}\dots\omega_{r_p}^{\alpha_{r_p}}$ with $0 \le \alpha_i \le p-1$ and α_i not all zero and with $\alpha_i = 1$ for the smallest i verifying $\alpha_i \ne 0$: the $F_i = \omega_i^p, \quad i = 1,\dots,r_p$, are singular primary, so $F = \Omega^p$ is singular primary.
  2. To each $\Omega = \omega_1^{\alpha_1}\dots\omega_{r_p}^{\alpha_{r_p}}$ with α_i not all zero and $\alpha_i = 1$ for the smallest i verifying $\alpha_i \ne 0$ corresponds **one** subgroup V_i of C_p.
  3. If $\omega_1^{\alpha_1}\dots\omega_{r_p}^{\alpha_{r_p}} = \omega_1^{\alpha'_1}\dots\omega_{r_p}^{\alpha'_{r_p}}$ then $\alpha_1 = \alpha'_1, \quad \dots, \alpha_{r_p} = \alpha'_{r_p}$.
- When $h^+ \equiv 0 \bmod p$ (which implies that $h^- \equiv 0 \bmod p$), we have, from Furtwangler theorem [13], see Ribenboim, [39] (6C) p 182, and from Hecke

theorem[17], see Ribenboim [39] (6D) p 182, there are r_p^+ *independant* unramified extensions extensions $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta, \varpi_i), \quad i = 1, \dots, r_p^+$,

$$G_i = \varpi_i^p \in \mathbb{Z}[\zeta] - \mathbb{Z}[\zeta]^*, \quad \varpi_i \notin \mathbb{Z}[\zeta]$$
$$G_i \times \overline{G}_i = \beta_i^p, \quad \beta_i \in \mathbb{Z}[\zeta + \zeta^{-1}]. \quad i = 1, \dots, r_p^+,$$

where $G_i\mathbb{Z}[\zeta] = \mathbf{c}_i^p$ is an ideal with $Cl(\mathbf{c}_i) \in C_p^-$. Observe that the r_p^+ unramified extensions $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta, \varpi_i)/\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$ are independant and there are no $r_p^+ + 1$ different independent such extensions.

- Let us consider another approach for the particular case where $h^+ \not\equiv 0 \bmod p$.
  - Let E_i, for $1 \leq i \leq \frac{p-3}{2}$, defined in Washington p 155, by formula

    $$E_i = \prod_{a=1}^{p-1} (\zeta^{(1-u)/2} \frac{1-\zeta^u}{1-\zeta})^{a^{2i}\tau_a^{-1}}. \tag{55}$$

    The expression $\zeta^{(1-u)/2}\frac{1-\zeta^u}{1-\zeta} \in \mathbb{Z}[\zeta + \zeta^{-1}]^*$ and so $E_i \in \mathbb{Z}[\zeta + \zeta^{-1}]^*$ is a unit, and then we can chose the determination $\omega_i = E_i^{1/p} \in \mathbb{R}$.
  - Let r_i be the index of irregularity,

    $$r_i = Card(\{B_{2j} \quad | \quad B_{2j} \equiv 0 \bmod p, \quad j = 1, 2, \dots, \frac{p-3}{2}\},$$

    where B_{2j} are the even Bernoulli numbers.
  - Let $i_j, \quad j = 1, \dots, r_i, \quad 1 \leq i_j \leq \frac{p-3}{2}$, be the irregular indices of $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$.
  - The p-elementary Hilbert class field can be explicitly described, see Washington [68], exercise 8.9 p 165:

    $$H = \mathbb{Q}(\zeta, E_{i_1}^{1/p}, \dots, E_{i_{r_p^-}}^{1/p}). \tag{56}$$

    and $r_i = r_p^-$.

4.1.2 Some results on structure of p-Hilbert class field of $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$

In this subsection, we give several general results on structure of p-elementary Hilbert class field.

Theorem 4.1. **** Let* $\mathbf{b}_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, r_p$*, be the ideals defined in relation (49) p. 51. Let* H *be the* p*-elementary Hilbert class field of* $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$*. Then* H *verifies the structure's properties:*

$$\begin{aligned}
&H = \mathbb{Q}(\zeta, \omega_1, \dots, \omega_{r_p})/\mathbb{Q}(\zeta),\\
&\omega_i^p \in \mathbb{Z}[\zeta], \quad \omega_i \notin \mathbb{Z}[\zeta], \quad i = 1, \dots, r_p,\\
&\omega_i^p \equiv c_i^p \ mod\ \pi^{p+1}, \quad c_i \in \mathbb{Z}, \quad c_i \not\equiv 0 \ mod\ p, \quad i = 1, \dots, r_p,\\
&\omega_i^p \mathbb{Z}[\zeta] = \mathbf{b}_i^{\delta_i p}, \quad \delta_i \in \{0, 1\}, \quad i = 1, \dots, r_p.
\end{aligned} \tag{57}$$

Proof. Apply results obtained in definition subsection 4.1.1 p. 51. □

Some definitions:

- Recall that r_p^- is the p-rank of the relative p-class group C_p^-. Recall that we have $\sigma(\mathbf{b}_i) \simeq \mathbf{b}_i^{\mu_i}, \quad \mu_i = u_{2m_i+1}$.
- Let us define the set $E = \{B_1, \dots, B_{r_p^-}\}$. The set E is partitioned in the two sets $E_1 = \{B_i \in E \mid B_i \text{ singular primary}\}$ and $E_2 = \{B_i \in E \mid B_i \text{ not singular primary}\}$
- Recall that, when $B_i \in E_1$ then $B_i \equiv 1 \bmod \pi^p$, so the extension $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta, B_i^{1/p})/\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$ is unramified and we can take for B_i defined in relations (50) p.52 and (51) p.52 the value $F_i = B_i$.

Theorem 4.2. **** Let us consider the* $B_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, r_p^-$*, defined in relations (50) p.52 and (51) p.52. There are* r_p^+ *singular primary numbers* $B_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, r_p^+$*, with*

$$\begin{aligned}
&B_i \in \mathbb{Z}[\zeta + \zeta^{-1}] - \mathbb{Z}[\zeta + \zeta^{-1}]^*, \quad i = 1, \dots, r_p^+,\\
&B_i \mathbb{Z}[\zeta] = \mathbf{b}_i^p, \quad B_i \overline{B}_i = \beta_i^p, \quad \beta_i \in \mathbb{Z}[\zeta + \zeta^{-1}],\\
&Cl(\mathbf{b}_i) \in C_p^- \quad i = 1, \dots, r_p^+.
\end{aligned} \tag{58}$$

So $Card(E_1) = r_p^+$*, or* $n^- = r_p^+$ *in relation (50).*

Proof. From Furtwangler, see Ribenboim [39] (6C) p 182 and from Hecke, see Ribenboim [39] (6D) p 182, there are exactly r_p^+ unramified **independant** extensions verifying

$$\begin{aligned}
&L_i = \mathbb{Q}(\zeta, \varpi_i)/\mathbb{Q}(\zeta), \quad i = 1, \dots, r_p^+,\\
&\varpi_i^p \notin \mathbb{Z}[\zeta]^*, \quad i = 1, \dots, r_p^+,\\
&\varpi_i^p \overline{\varpi}_i^p = \alpha_i^p, \quad \alpha_i \in \mathbb{Q}(\zeta + \zeta^{-1}),\\
&\varpi_i^p = G_i \equiv c_i^p \bmod \pi^{p+1}, \quad c_i \in \mathbb{Z}, \quad c_i \not\equiv 0 \bmod p,\\
&G_i \mathbb{Z}[\zeta] = \mathbf{c}_i^p, \quad Cl(\mathbf{c}_i) \in C_p^-.
\end{aligned}$$

Let us consider the $B_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, r_p^-$. Let n^- be the number of the B_i singular primary among them. We have seen that $F_i = B_i \notin \mathbb{Z}[\zeta + \zeta^{-1}]^*$ for $i = 1, \dots, n^-$ and that $F_i \in \mathbb{Z}[\zeta + \zeta^{-1}]^*$ for $i = n^- + 1, \dots, r_p$. From $\mathbf{c}_i \in C_p^-$ in relation (58), we can write

$$G_i = B_1^{\nu_{1,i}} \times \cdots \times B_{n^-}^{\nu_{n^-,i}} \times F_{n^-+1}^{\nu_{n^-+1,i}} \times \cdots \times F_{r_p}^{\nu_{r_p,i}}.$$

Observing that $G_i \overline{G}_i = \alpha_i^p$ and that $B_i \overline{B}_i = \beta_i^p$, we get

$$\alpha_i^p = \beta_1^p \times \cdots \times \beta_{n^-}^p \times F_{n^-+1}^{2\nu_{n^-+1,i}} \times \cdots \times F_{r_p}^{2\nu_{r_p,i}}, \quad i = 1, \dots, r_p.$$

The unramified extensions $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta, F_i^{1/p})/\mathbb{Q}(\zeta), \quad i = n^- + 1, \dots, r_p$, are independant, therefore $\nu_{i,n^-+1} = \dots = \nu_{i,r_p^-} \equiv 0 \bmod p$, and so

$$G_i = B_1^{\nu_{1,i}} \times \cdots \times B_{n^-}^{\nu_{n^-,i}}, \quad i = 1, \dots, r_p^+.$$

The r_p^+ extensions $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta, G_i^{1/p})/\mathbb{Q}(\zeta), \quad i = 1, \dots, r_p^+$, are independant, and from Hecke theorem there is no $r_p + 1$ such independant extensions. Therefore $n^- = r_p^+$, which achieves the proof. □

In the next theorem, we refine the Hilbert class field theorem 57 p. 55.

Theorem 4.3. **** With the same global meaning of index i in all the theorem, the Hilbert p-class field verifies the structure:*

$$\begin{aligned}
&H = \mathbb{Q}(\zeta, \omega_1, \dots, \omega_{r_p}),\\
&\omega_i^p = B_i, \quad B_i \in \mathbb{Z}[\zeta], \quad B_i\mathbb{Z}[\zeta] = \mathbf{b}_i^p,\\
&B_i\overline{B}_i = \beta_i^p, \quad \beta_i \in \mathbb{Z}[\zeta + \zeta^{-1}] - \mathbb{Z}[\zeta + \zeta^{-1}]^*, \quad i = 1, \dots, r_p^+,\\
&Cl(\mathbf{b}_i) \in C_p^-, \quad i = 1, \dots, r_p^+,\\
&\omega_i^p \in \mathbb{Z}[\zeta + \zeta^{-1}]^*, \quad i = r_p^+ + 1, \dots, r_p^-,\\
&\omega_i^p\mathbb{Z}[\zeta + \zeta^{-1}] = \mathbf{b}_i^{\delta_i}, \quad Cl(\mathbf{b}_i) \in C_p^+, \quad \delta_i \in \{0, 1\}, \quad i = r_p^- + 1, \dots, r_p,
\end{aligned} \tag{59}$$

where $B_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, r_p^+$, are singular primary.

Proof. Apply theorem 4.1 p. 55, theorem 4.2 p. 55. □

Theorem 4.4. *Let us consider the set of singular primary elements $B_i, \quad i \in I_1 = \{1, \dots, r_p^+\} \cup \{r_p^- + 1, \dots, r_p^- + n^+\}$. Let us consider the set of not singular primary elements $B_i, \quad i \in I_2 = \{r_p^+ + 1, \dots, r_p^-\} \cup \{r_p^- + n^+ + 1, \dots, r_p\}$. Let $\Gamma \in \mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$*

$$\Gamma = c^p \times \prod_{i \in I_1} B_i^{\nu_i} \times \prod_{i \in I_2} B_i^{\nu_i}, \quad c \in \mathbb{Q}(\zeta).$$

If Γ is singular primary then $\nu_i \equiv 0 \bmod p$ for all $i \in I_2$.

Proof. Apply theorem 4.2 and relations (50) p.52 and (51) p. 52. □

4.1.3 On Galois group of extension $H/\mathbb{Q}$

.

- Let $H = \mathbb{Q}(\zeta, F_1^{1/p}, \dots, F_{r_p}^{1/p})/\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$ be the p-elementary Hilbert's extension.
- Let G_H be the Galois group of $H/\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$. Let us consider the $\mathbb{Q}$-isomorphisms θ of $H/\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$ defined by:
$$\theta_i^{j_i} : \omega_i \to \omega_i \times \zeta^{j_i}, \quad i = 1, \dots, r_p, \quad j_i = 0, \dots, p-1,$$
$$\theta_{j_1,\dots,j_{r_p}} = \theta_1^{j_1} \circ \dots \circ \theta_{r_p}^{j_{r_p}}.$$
- Let B be the ring of integers of H and B_H^* the group of units of B_H. Let θ be the $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$-isomorphisms of H previously defined.
- Let $\sigma : \zeta \to \zeta^u$ be the $\mathbb{Q}$-isomorphism of $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$. Observe that σ can be extended to H unambiguously because $F_j, \quad j = 1, \dots, r_p$, singular primary implies that $\sigma(F_j)$ is also singular primary, therefore
$$\sigma(\omega_j) =_{def} (\sigma(F_j))^{1/p} \in H,$$
if not the unramified extension $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta, \sigma(\omega_j)) \not\subset H$; Then, we get
$$\sigma(\omega_j) \in H, \quad j = 1, \dots, r_p.$$
Therefore
$$\sigma(\omega_j) = P_j(\omega_1, \dots, \omega_{r_p}), \quad j = 1, \dots, r_p, \tag{60}$$
where $P_j(\omega_1, \dots, \omega_{r_p})$ is a polynomial of $\omega_1, \dots, \omega_{r_p}$, with coefficients in $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$. We have in the same way
$$\sigma \circ \sigma(\omega_j) = \sigma(P_j(\omega_1, \dots, \omega_{r_p})) = P_j(\sigma(\omega_1, \dots, \sigma(\omega_{r_p})) \in H,$$
and so on, with the choice of determinations of $\sigma^k(\omega_j) =_{def} (\sigma^k(F_j))^{1/p}, \quad j = 1, \dots, r_p$, such that
(61)
$$\sigma^k(\omega_j) = \sigma \circ \sigma^{k-1}(\omega_j) = \sigma \circ (\sigma^{k-1}(F_j))^{1/p} =_{def} (\sigma^k(F_j))^{1/p}, \quad k = 1, \dots, p-1.$$

Therefore we have proved :

Lemma 4.5. *Let the p-elementary Hilbert class field H of $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$, defined by $H = \mathbb{Q}(\zeta, F_1^{1/p}, \dots, F_{r_p}^{1/p})$. Then $H/\mathbb{Q}$ is a Galois extension, (not abelian) defined by the $\mathbb{Q}$-isomorphisms $\sigma^i \circ \theta, \quad i = 0, \dots, p-2$, where σ is the extension of the $\mathbb{Q}$-isomorphisms σ of $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$ to H defined above, and where θ are the $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$-isomorphisms of H and*
$$[H : \mathbb{Q}] = (p-1) \times p^{r_p}. \tag{62}$$

Theorem 4.6. **** Let C_1 be a subgroup of order p of C_p such that $\sigma(C_1) = C_1$. Let $M = \mathbb{Q}(\zeta, \Omega)/\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$ be a cyclic unramified extension of $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$ corresponding by Artin map to C_1. Then $M/\mathbb{Q}$ is Galois.*

4.2 Congruences mod π in p-elementary Hilbert class field H

Lemma 4.7. *Let H be the p-elementary Hilbert's class field of the field $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$. Let π_H be a prime of H above $\pi = (\zeta - 1)\mathbb{Z}[\zeta]$. Let $\alpha, \beta \in H$ with $\alpha \not\equiv 0 \mod \pi_H$ and $\alpha \equiv \beta$ mod π_H. Then $\alpha^p \equiv \beta^p$ mod π_H^{p+1}.*

Proof. The absolute norm of the ideal π_H verifies $N_{H/\mathbb{Q}}(\pi_H) = p$. Let $\lambda = (\zeta - 1)$. We have $\alpha - \beta \equiv 0 \mod \pi_H \Rightarrow (\alpha - \zeta^k \beta) \equiv 0 \mod \pi_H$ for $k = 0, 1, \ldots, p-1$. Therefore, for all k, $0 \leq k \leq p-1$, there exists $a_k \in \mathbb{N}$, $0 \leq a_k \leq p-1$, such that $(\alpha - \zeta^k \beta) \equiv \lambda a_k \mod \pi_H^2$. For another value l, $0 \leq l \leq p-1$, we have, in the same way, $(\alpha - \zeta^l \beta) \equiv \lambda a_l \mod \pi_H^2$, hence $(\zeta^k - \zeta^l)\beta \equiv \lambda(a_k - a_l) \mod \pi_H^2$. For $k \neq l$ we get $a_k \neq a_l$, because $\pi_H \| (\zeta^k - \zeta^l)$ and because hypothesis $\alpha \not\equiv 0 \mod \pi_H$ implies that $\beta \not\equiv 0 \mod \pi_H$. Therefore, there exists one and only one k such that $(\alpha - \zeta^k \beta) \equiv 0 \mod \pi_H^2$. Then, we have $\prod_{j=0}^{p-1}(\alpha - \zeta^j \beta) = (\alpha^p - \beta^p) \equiv 0 \mod \pi_H^{p+1}$. ☐

Lemma 4.8. *Let $H/\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$ be the p-elementary Hilbert class field of $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$. Let B_H be the ring of integers of H. Suppose that*

$$\beta \equiv \alpha \ mod\ \pi, \quad \alpha, \beta \in B_H$$

Then

$$\beta^p - \alpha^p \equiv 0 \ mod\ \pi^{p+1}.$$

Proof. The principal ideal π of $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$ splits totally in p-elementary Hilbert's class field H of $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$. For each prime ideal π_i of H above π, which is of residual degree 1, we can apply lemma 4.7 p. 58 to get $\beta^p - \alpha^p \equiv 0 \mod \pi_i^{p+1}$, which leads to the proof. ☐

Let u be a primitive root mod p. Let $\sigma : \zeta \to \zeta^u$ be a $\mathbb{Q}$-isomorphism of $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$. Let us consider the p-Hilbert class field $H = \mathbb{Q}(\zeta, \omega_1, \ldots, \omega_{r_p})/\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$. We know that $H/\mathbb{Q}$ is a Galois extension and so $\sigma \in Gal(\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)/\mathbb{Q})$ can be extended (see lemma 4.5 p. 57), to $\sigma_H \in G_H$ where $G_H = Gal(H/\mathbb{Q})$, where $\sigma_H(\omega_i) \in H$, $i = 1, \ldots, r_p$, and σ_H chosen with $\sigma_H^{p-1}(\omega_i) = \omega_i$, $i = 1, \ldots, r_p$, from definitions of subsection 4.1.3 p. 57. Therefore, for this extension σ_H, the map σ_H^{p-1} is the identity map. Let π_i, $i = 1, \ldots, p^{r_p}$, be the prime ideals of H above the prime ideal π of $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$. The notation $\sigma_H^{(p-1)/2}(\pi_i)$, $i = 1, \ldots, r_p$ is meaningful and $\sigma_H^{(p-1)/2}(\pi_i)$ is a prime ideal of H above π. The next theorem describes the action of conjugation $\sigma_H^{(p-1)/2}$ on prime ideals of H above π.

Theorem 4.9. **** There exists at least one prime ideal π_H of H above π such that $\sigma_H^{(p-1)/2}(\pi_H) = \pi_H$.*

Proof.

- Let us note here $\tau = \sigma_H^{(p-1)/2}$ for $\sigma_H \in G_H$. Let $H = \mathbb{Q}(\zeta, \omega_1, \dots, \omega_{r_p})/\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$ be the Hilbert p-class field of $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$.
- Let us consider the unramified extension $M_1 = \mathbb{Q}(\zeta, \omega_1)/\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$. Let $\pi_1, \dots, \pi_p$ be the p prime ideals of K_1 above π. Let B_1 be the ring of integers of M_1. Then $\pi B_1 = \pi_1 \dots \pi_p$. By conjugation we get $\pi B = \tau(\pi) B = \pi_1 \dots \pi_p = \tau(\pi_1) \dots \tau(\pi_p)$, where we note that $\tau(\pi_1), \dots, \tau(\pi_p)$ are also prime ideals of M_1 above π because $M_1/\mathbb{Q}$ is Galois. Therefore $\tau(\pi_1) = \pi_k$ and $\pi_1 = \tau^2(\pi_1) = \tau(\pi_k)$. But there is an odd number p of primes $\pi_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, p$; therefore there exists at least one $l \in \mathbb{N}, \quad 1 \leq l \leq p$ such that $\pi_l = \tau(\pi_l)$.
- Let us consider the unramified extension $M_2 = \mathbb{Q}(\zeta, \omega_1, \omega_2)/\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$. Let $\pi_{1,1}, \dots, \pi_{1,p}$ be the p prime ideals of M_2 under π_1. Let B_2 be the ring of integers of M_2. Then $\pi_1 B_2 = \pi_{1,1} \dots \pi_{1,p}$. By conjugation we get $\pi_1 B = \tau(\pi_1) B = \pi_{1,1} \dots \pi_{1,p} = \tau(\pi_{1,1}) \dots \tau(\pi_{1,p})$, where we note that $\tau(\pi_{1,1}), \dots, \tau(\pi_{1,p})$ are prime ideals of K_2 under π_1. Therefore $\tau(\pi_{1,1}) = \pi_{1,k}$ and $\pi_{1,1} = \tau^2(\pi_{1,1}) = \tau(\pi_{1,k})$. But there is an odd number p of primes $\pi_{1,i}, \quad i = 1, \dots, p$; therefore there exists at least one $l \in \mathbb{N}, \quad 1 \leq l \leq p$ such that $\pi_{1,l} = \tau(\pi_{1,l})$.
- And so on up to $K_{r_p} = H = \mathbb{Q}(\zeta, \omega_1, \dots, \omega_{r_p})$: finally there exists at least one prime ideal π_H of H verifying $\tau(\pi_H) = \pi_H$.

□

Theorem 4.10. *Let $H/\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$ be the p-elementary Hilbert class field of $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$. Let $\pi = (\zeta - 1)\mathbb{Z}[\zeta]$. Let $\sigma : \zeta \to \zeta^u$ be a $\mathbb{Q}$-isomorphism of $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$. Let σ_H be the extension of σ to a $\mathbb{Q}$-isomorphism of H with σ_H^{p-1} identity map. Let $\tau = \sigma_H^{(p-1)/2}$. Let $\alpha \in H$ where α is coprime with π. Then there exists a prime ideal π_H of H above π such that*

$$\frac{\alpha}{\tau(\alpha)} \equiv 1 \ mod \ \pi_H. \tag{63}$$

Proof. Let us consider $\alpha \in H$ with $\alpha B + \pi B = B$. Let π_H be a prime of H above π with

$\pi_H = \tau(\pi_H)$. $N_{H/\mathbb{Q}}(\pi_H) = p$ implies that there exists $a \in \mathbb{N}, \quad 1 \leq a \leq p-1$, such that $\alpha \equiv a \bmod \pi_H$. By conjugation, we get $\tau(\alpha) \equiv a \bmod \tau(\pi_H) = \pi_H$. and so $\frac{\alpha}{\tau(\alpha)} \equiv 1 \bmod \pi_H$. □

5 On Hilbert class field of $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta+\zeta^{-1})$

Let r_p be the rank of the p-class group C_p. Let r_p^+ be the rank of the p-class group C_p^+. In theorem 4.3 p.56, we have seen, from a result on Hilbert class field of Hecke and Futwangler that $r_p \geq 2r_p^+$. Starting of this result, in this subsection, we investigate some relations between the Hilbert class field of $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$ and of $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta+\zeta^{-1})$.

5.1 Some definitions

- Let $p > 3$ be a prime.
- Let $\zeta \in \mathbb{C}$ be a root of the equation $X^{p-1} + X^{p-2} + \cdots + X + 1 = 0$.
- Let $K = \mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$ be the p-cyclotomic field.
- Let u be a primitive root $\bmod p$. Let $\sigma : \zeta \to \zeta^u$ be a $\mathbb{Q}$-isomorphism generating $Gal(K/\mathbb{Q})$.
- Let h be the class number of K.
- Let H be the Hilbert class field of K.
- Let $K^+ = \mathbb{Q}(\zeta+\zeta^{-1})$ be the maximal totally real subfield of K, verifying $[K : K^+] = 2$.
- Let h^+ be the class number of the field K^+.
- Let H^+ be the Hilbert class field of K^+.
- Let C_p be the p-class group of K.
- Let C_p^+ be the p-class group of K^+, so with $C_p^+ \subset C_p$.
- Let $C_p^- = C_p/C_p^+$ be the relative p-class group.
- Let the ideals $\mathbf{b}_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, r_p$, defined in relation 49 p. 51, where $Cl(\mathbf{b}_i) \in C_p^-, \quad i = 1, \dots, r_p^-$ and $Cl(\mathbf{b}_i) \in C_p^+, \quad i = r_p^- + 1, \dots, r_p$, where $r_p = r_p^- + r_p^+$. Suppose that $h^+ \equiv 0 \bmod p$, we have seen that:
    - there exists at least one cyclic group $C_1^+ =< Cl(\mathbf{b}_+) > \subset C_p^+$ of order p, where $\mathbf{b}_+$ is an ideal not principal of K with $\mathbf{b}_+^p \simeq \mathbb{Z}[\zeta]$ and $\sigma(\mathbf{b}_+) \simeq \mathbf{b}_+^{\mu_+}, \quad \mu_+ \in \mathbf{F}_p^*, \quad \mu_+^{(p-1)/2} = 1$.

  - From theorem 4.3 p. 56 derived of Hecke and Furtwangler, there exists a corresponding cyclic group $C_1^- =< Cl(\mathbf{b}_-) > \subset C_p^-$ of order p, where $\mathbf{b}_-$ is an ideal not principal of $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$ with $\mathbf{b}_-^p \simeq \mathbb{Z}[\zeta]$ and $\sigma(\mathbf{b}_-) \simeq \mathbf{b}_-^{\mu^-}, \quad \mu^- \in \mathbf{F}_p^*, \quad \mu_-^{(p-1)/2} = -1$.

- From Hilbert class field theorem, $h^+ \equiv 0 \bmod p$ implies that there exists at least one field, cyclic unramified extension L/K^+, with $K^+ \subset L \subset H^+, \quad [L : K^+] = p$.

5.2 Relations between Hilbert class fields H and H^+

Lemma 5.1. *Suppose that* $h^+ \equiv 0$ *mod* p *and let* L *be the field defined immediatly above. The extension* $L/K^+ \subset H^+/K^+$ *is of form* $L = K^+(\Omega_1 + \frac{b}{\Omega_1})$ *where* $\Omega_1^p = F \in K - K^+$ *where* $b \in K^+$ *and* $F\overline{F} = b^p$.

Proof.

- The field L can be written in form

$$\begin{aligned} & L = K^+(\Omega), \\ (64) \qquad & P(\Omega) = \Omega^p + a_{p-1}\Omega^{p-1} + \cdots + a_1\Omega + a_0 = 0, \\ & a_i \in K^+, \quad i = 0, \dots, p-1, \quad a_0 \neq 0, \end{aligned}$$

  where $P(\Omega)$ is the minimal polynomial of $\Omega \in \mathbb{C}$. From $\zeta \in \mathbb{C}$ and $a_i \in K^+$, we derive that $a_i \in \mathbb{R}$. The coefficients of $P(\Omega)$ are in $\mathbb{R}$ and the degree p of $P(\Omega)$ is odd, therefore there exists at least one root $\Omega \in \mathbb{R}$. In the sequel, we choose this root. Therefore, if we note $\overline{\Omega}$ the complex conjugate of Ω, then $\Omega = \overline{\Omega}$.

- Let us denote $M = K(\Omega)$. Then $[M : K] \times [K : K^+] = [M : L] \times [L : K^+]$ and so $[M : K] \times 2 = [M : L] \times p$, which implies that $[M : K] = p$ and [M:L]=2.

- Show that M/K is a cyclic extension: L/K^+ is a cyclic extension. Let θ_L be a K^+-isomorphism generating the Galois group $Gal(L/K^+)$. We define a K-isomorphim θ_M generating the Galois group $Gal(M/K)$ by $\theta_M(a) = \theta_L(a)$ for $a \in L \subset M$ and $\theta_M(\zeta) = \zeta$ for $\zeta \in M, \quad \zeta \notin L$.

- From $\zeta \in K$ and from $[M : K] = p$ and M/K cyclic, we derive that M/K is a Kummer cyclic extension. Therefore there exists $\Omega_1 \in M, \quad \Omega_1 \notin K$ such that $M = K(\Omega_1)$ where $\Omega_1 \in \mathbb{C}$ is one of the p roots of the equation $\Omega_1^p = F$ with $F \in K$. A K-isomorphim θ_M generating $Gal(M/K)$ is defined by $\theta_M : \Omega_1 \rightarrow \Omega_1 \times \zeta, \quad \zeta \rightarrow \zeta$.

- Show that the extension M/K is unramified:
  - Let π_{K^+} be the prime ideal of K^+ above p. Let $\pi_K = (1-\zeta)\mathbb{Z}[\zeta]$ be the prime ideal of K above π_{K^+}. Let π_M be a prime of M above π_K. Let π_L be a prime of L above π_{K^+}. The extension L/K^+ is unramified. The multiplicativity of ramification indexes in the extensions $(M/K, K/K^+)$ and $(M/L, L/K^+)$ implies that π_K does not ramify in M/K:

    $$e(\pi_M|\pi_{K^+}) = e(\pi_M|\pi_K) \times e(\pi_K|\pi_{K^+}) = e(\pi_M|\pi_K) \times 2 \geq 2,$$
    $$e(\pi_M|\pi_{K^+}) = e(\pi_M|\pi_L) \times e(\pi_L|\pi_{K^+}) = e(\pi_M|\pi_L) \leq 2 = [M:L],$$

    which implies that $e(\pi_M|\pi_K) = 1$.
  - Let $q \neq p$ be a prime. Let $\mathbf{q}_{K^+}$ be a prime ideal of K^+ above q. Let $\mathbf{q}_K$ be a prime ideal of K above $\mathbf{q}_{K^+}$. Let $\mathbf{q}_M$ be a prime of M above $\mathbf{q}_K$. Let $\mathbf{q}_L$ be a prime of L above $\mathbf{q}_{K^+}$. The extension L/K^+ is unramified. The multiplicativity of ramification indexes in the extensions $(M/K, K/K^+)$ and $(M/L, L/K^+)$ implies that $\mathbf{q}_K$ does not ramify in the extension M/K:

    $$e(\mathbf{q}_M|\mathbf{q}_{K^+}) = e(\mathbf{q}_M|\mathbf{q}_K) \times e(\mathbf{q}_K|\mathbf{q}_{K^+}) = e(\mathbf{q}_M|\mathbf{q}_K),$$
    $$e(\mathbf{q}_M|\mathbf{q}_{K^+}) = e(\mathbf{q}_M|\mathbf{q}_L) \times e(\mathbf{q}_L|\mathbf{q}_{K^+}) = e(\mathbf{q}_M|\mathbf{q}_L).$$

    But $M = L(\zeta)$, $\quad [M:L] = 2$ and $q \neq p$ implies that $e(\mathbf{q}_M|\mathbf{q}_L) = 1$, which leads to $e(\mathbf{q}_M|\mathbf{q}_K) = 1$.
  - Therefore, M/K is unramified and cyclic, therefore $M \subset H$.

- Let us denote $\overline{\Omega}_1$ the complex conjugate of Ω_1. Let $\Omega_2 = \Omega_1\overline{\Omega}_1$. From the definitions $\Omega_2 \in \mathbb{R}$. We get $\Omega_2^p = F\overline{F}$, where $F\overline{F} \in K^+ \subset \mathbb{R}$.

- In the sequel, $(F\overline{F})^{1/p}$ is to be understood as the determination corresponding to the real p^{th} root of $F\overline{F} \in K^+ \subset \mathbb{R}$.

- We show that the case $(F\overline{F})^{1/p} \notin K^+$ lead to a contradiction. From $M = K(\Omega) = K(\Omega_1)$, we derive that $\Omega_1 = P_1(\Omega)$ where $P_1(\Omega) = \sum_{i=0}^{p-1} b_i\Omega^i, \quad b_i \in K$. By complex conjugation, observing that $\Omega = \overline{\Omega}$, we get $\overline{\Omega}_1 = \sum_{i=0}^{p-1} \overline{b}_i\Omega^i$. Thus

  $$\Omega_2 = \Omega_1\overline{\Omega}_1 = (\sum_{i=0}^{p-1} b_i\Omega^i)(\sum_{i=0}^{p-1} \overline{b}_i\Omega^i) \in K^+(\Omega) = L,$$

  and so $K^+(\Omega_2) \subset L$. From $\Omega_2^p = F\overline{F} \in K^+$ and $(F\overline{F})^{1/p} \notin K^+$, we derive that $[K^+(\Omega_2) : K^+] = p$ and so $L = K^+(\Omega_2)$. The extension L/K^+ is cyclic and so the roots $\Omega_2\zeta^i, \quad i = 0, \ldots, p-1$, of the equation $X^p - F\overline{F} = 0$ are in L and so $\zeta \in L$, contradiction because $M \neq L$.

- Suppose now that $b = (F\overline{F})^{1/p} \in \mathbb{Z}[\zeta + \zeta^{-1}]$:
  - From $\Omega_1^p \overline{\Omega}_1^p = F\overline{F} = b^p$, we derive that, without ambiguity in the determinations, $\Omega_1 \overline{\Omega}_1 = b$ where $\Omega_1 \overline{\Omega}_1 \in \mathbb{R}, \quad b \in \mathbb{R}$. Then let $\Omega_3 = \Omega_1 + \overline{\Omega}_1 = \Omega_1 + \frac{b}{\Omega_1}$. At first note that $\Omega_3 \not\in K^+$, if not we should have simultaneously $\Omega_1 \overline{\Omega}_1 \in K^+$ and $\Omega_1 + \overline{\Omega}_1 \in K^+$ and Ω_1 and $\overline{\Omega}_1$ should be the two roots of an equation $X^2 + a_1 X + a_2 = 0, \quad a_1, a_2 \in K^+$, which contradicts $\Omega_1^p = F, \quad F \in K, \quad F^{1/p} \not\in K$. This implies that $\Omega_3 = \sum_{i=0}^{p-1} (b_i + \overline{b}_i) \Omega^i \in K^+(\Omega)$. Therefore from $K^+(\Omega_3) \subset K^+(\Omega)$ and from $\Omega_3 \not\in K^+$, we derive that $L = K^+(\Omega_3) = K^+(\Omega)$.
  - The K-isomorphims of M/K are defined by:

    $$\theta_M^i : \Omega_1 \rightarrow \Omega_1 \times \zeta^i, \quad \zeta \rightarrow \zeta.$$

  - Observe that $\Omega_1 \neq \overline{\Omega}_1$, if not we should have $\Omega_1 = \frac{b}{\Omega_1}$ and so $\Omega_1^2 = b, \quad b \in K^+$, which clearly contradicts $\Omega_1^p = F, \quad F \in K, \quad F^{1/p} \not\in K$. The K^+-isomorphisms θ_L^i of L/K^+, restrictions of K-isomorphisms of M/K are therefore defined by:

    $$\theta_L^i : \Omega_1 + \frac{b}{\Omega_1} \rightarrow \Omega_1 \zeta^i + \frac{b}{\Omega_1 \zeta^i}, \quad \zeta + \zeta^{-1} \rightarrow \zeta + \zeta^{-1},$$

    because

    $$\Omega_1 \zeta^i + \frac{b}{\Omega_1 \zeta^i} = \Omega_1 \zeta^i + \overline{\Omega}_1 \zeta^{-i} = \sum_{j=0}^{p-1} b_j \zeta^i \Omega^j + \sum_{j=0}^{p-1} \overline{b}_j \zeta^{-i} \Omega^j$$
    $$= \sum_{j=0}^{p-1} (b_j \zeta^i + \overline{b_j \zeta^i}) \Omega^j \in K^+(\Omega) = L.$$

□

Lemma 5.2. *The field $M = K(\Omega_1)$ is a CM-field.*

Proof.

- $[M : L] = 2$ and $M = L(\zeta)$. It is sufficient to prove that $L = K^+(\Omega_1 + \overline{\Omega}_1)$ is totally real.
- From $\Omega_1^p = F$ then $\Omega_1 = F^{1/p}$ for one choice of the root $F^{1/p}$. Recall that $\overline{\Omega}_1$ is the complex conjugate of Ω_1. Then $\Omega_1^p \overline{\Omega}_1^p = F\overline{F}$ and $\Omega_1 \overline{\Omega}_1 = (F\overline{F})^{1/p} =$ where $(F\overline{F})^{1:p} = b \in K^+$ is the real root defined unambiguously.

- Let $\sigma \in Gal(K/\mathbb{Q})$. Then $\sigma(\Omega_1)\times\sigma(\overline{\Omega}_1) = \sigma(b)$. In an other part $\sigma(\Omega_1)^p\overline{\sigma(\Omega_1)}^p = \sigma(F\overline{F})$, which gives the unambiguous definition $\sigma(\Omega_1)\overline{\sigma(\Omega_1)} = (\sigma(F\overline{F}))^{1/p} = \sigma(b)$ for $\sigma(b) \in \mathbb{R}$ defined unambiguously and so $\sigma(\overline{\Omega}_1) = \overline{\sigma(\Omega_1)}$.
- Then $\sigma(\Omega_1 + \overline{\Omega}_1) = \sigma(\Omega_1) + \sigma(\overline{\Omega}_1) = \sigma(\Omega_1) + \overline{\sigma(\Omega_1)} \in \mathbb{R}$. In the same way $\sigma(\Omega_1\zeta + \overline{\Omega}_1\zeta^{-1}) = \sigma(\Omega_1)\sigma(\zeta) + \sigma(\overline{\Omega}_1)\sigma(\zeta^{-1}) = \sigma(\Omega_1)\zeta + \overline{\sigma(\Omega_1)\zeta} \in \mathbb{R}$.
- Therefore, all the conjugates $\sigma^i\circ\theta^j(\Omega_1+\overline{\Omega}_1), \quad i = 0,\dots,p-2, \quad j = 0,\dots,p-1$ are real and $L/\mathbb{Q}$ is totally real, which achieves the proof.

□

5.3 Artin map for Hilbert class fields H and H^+

The next results aims to explicit Artin map of Hilbert class field of $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$ and of $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta+\zeta^{-1})$.

Lemma 5.3.

- *In Artin map $C_p \longleftrightarrow Gal(H/K)$:*
  - $< Cl(\mathbf{b}_+) > \subset C_p^+ \subset C_p$ *corresponds to unramified cyclic* $M/K = K(\Omega_1)/K$ *with:*
    - $\Omega_1^p = F \in K - K^+, \quad F\overline{F} = b^p, \quad b \in K.$
    - $F\mathbb{Z}[\zeta] = \mathbf{b}_-^p, \quad Cl(\mathbf{b}_-) \in C_p^-.$
  - $< Cl(\mathbf{b}_-) > \subset C_p^-$ *corresponds to unramified cyclic extension* $N = K(\omega)/K$ *with:*
    - $\omega^p = F' \in \mathbb{Z}[\zeta+\zeta^{-1}]^*.$
    - $F\mathbb{Z}[\zeta] = \mathbf{b}_-^p, \quad Cl(\mathbf{b}_-) \in C_p^-.$
- *In Artin map $C_p^+ \longleftrightarrow Gal(H^+/K^+)$: $< Cl(\mathbf{b}_+) >$ corresponds to unramified cyclic extension* $L/K^+ = K^+(\Omega_1 + \overline{\Omega_1})/K^+ = K^+(\Omega_1 + \frac{b}{\Omega_1})/K^+$ *with:*
  - $\Omega_1^p = F \in K - K^+, \quad F\overline{F} = b^p, \quad b \in K.$
  - $F\mathbb{Z}[\zeta] = \mathbf{b}_-^p, \quad Cl(\mathbf{b}_-) \in C_p^-.$

Proof.

- Let $C_1^+ =< Cl(\mathbf{b}_+) > \subset C_p^+ \subset C_p$ be the cyclic group of order p corresponding by Artin map to $Gal(L/K^+)$. From
$$K^+ \subset K, \quad L \subset M, \quad L \subset H^+, \quad M \subset H,$$
$$[L : K^+] = [M : K] = p, \quad [M : L] = [K : K^+] = 2,$$
then by Artin map, we get (see for instance Washington [68] p. 400):

  - $C_1^+ =< Cl(\mathbf{b}_+\mathbb{Z}[\zeta]) >\cong Gal(M/K)$ by Artin map, where $\mathbf{b}_+$ can be chosen ideal of K^+ with $\mathbf{b}_+^p$ principal.
  - $< Cl(N_{K/K^+}(\mathbf{b}_+)) >=< Cl(\mathbf{b}_+^2) >\cong Gal(L/K^+)$ by Artin map.
  - Let θ_L generating $Gal(L/K^+)$ and θ_M generating $Gal(M/K)$. Then θ_L is the restriction of θ_M to $L \subset M$.

- With another point of view for the same result: Let $i \in \mathbb{N}, \quad 0 \leq i \leq p-1$. Then by Artin map
  - $Cl(\mathbf{b}_+^i) \leftrightarrow \theta_L^i : \Omega_1 + \overline{\Omega}_1 \rightarrow \Omega_1\zeta^i + \overline{\Omega}_1\zeta^{-i}, \quad \theta_L^i \in Gal(L/K^+), \quad L/K^+ \subset H^+/K^+$, by Artin map in H^+.
  - $\theta_L^i \in Gal(L/K^+) \leftrightarrow \theta_M^i : \Omega_1 \rightarrow \Omega_1\zeta^i, \quad \theta_M^i \in Gal(M/K)$,
  - $\theta_M^i \in Gal(M/K) \leftrightarrow Cl(\mathbf{b}_+^i)$ by Artin map in H.

□

The next theorem summarizes Artin map in global context of p-elementary Hilbert class fields of $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$ and of $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta+\zeta^{-1})$.

- In relations (53) p. 53 and (54) p. 53, we have defined the set $\mathbf{M}$ of r_p independant unramified extensions $M_i = \mathbb{Q}(\zeta,\omega_i)/\mathbb{Q}(\zeta), \quad i=1,\dots,r_p$, with

$$\begin{aligned}
&\omega_i^p = B_i, \quad i=1,\dots,r_p^+,\\
&\omega_i^p \in \mathbb{Z}[\zeta+\zeta^{-1}]^*, \quad i=r_p^++1,\dots,r_p^-,\\
&\omega_i^p = B_i, \quad i=r_p^-+1,\dots,r_p^-+n^+,\\
&\omega_i^p \in \mathbb{Z}[\zeta+\zeta^{-1}]^*, \quad i=r_p^-+n^++1,\dots,r_p.
\end{aligned}$$

- For $i=r_p^++1,\dots,r_p^-$ and for $i=r_p^-+n^++1,\dots,r_p$, we choose ω_i such that the extension $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta,\omega_i)/\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$ corresponds by Artin map to the group $< Cl(\mathbf{b}_i) >$ of order p for the same index i. Thus the set $\mathbf{M}$ of r_p independant unramified extensions is completely defined. This definition of set $\mathbf{M}$ is used in the sequel.

Theorem 5.4. **** Let $\mathbf{b}_i, \quad i=1,\dots,r_p$, be the ideals defined in relation (49) p. 51. With the meaning of index i of theorem 4.3 p. 56, the Artin map $C_p \leftrightarrow H$ and $C_p^+ \leftrightarrow H^+$ verify:*

- *In Artin map $C_p \leftrightarrow Gal(H/K)$ for $i=1,\dots,r_p^+$ then*
  - *$< Cl(\mathbf{b}_{r_p^-+i}) > \subset C_p^+$ corresponds to unramified cyclic $M_i/K = K(\omega_i)/K$ with:*

    - $\omega_i^p = F_i \in K - K^+, \quad F_i\overline{F_i} = b_i^p, \quad b_i \in K.$
    - $F_i\mathbb{Z}[\zeta] = \mathbf{b}_i^p, \quad Cl(\mathbf{b}_i) \in C_p^-.$
  - $< Cl(\mathbf{b}_i) > \subset C_p^-$ *corresponds to unramified cyclic extension* $M_{r_p^-+i}/K = K(\omega_{r_p^-+i})/K$ *with:*
    - $\omega_{r_p^-+i}^p = F_i' \in \mathbb{Z}[\zeta + \zeta^{-1}]^*.$
    - $F_i\mathbb{Z}[\zeta] = \mathbf{b}_i^p, \quad Cl(\mathbf{b}_i) \in C_p^-.$

- *In Artin map* $C_p \rightarrow Gal(H/K)$ *for* $i = r_p^+ + 1, \dots, r_p^-$ *then* $< Cl(\mathbf{b}_i) > \subset C_p^-$ *corresponds to unramified cyclic extension* $M_i/K = K(\omega_i)/K$ *with:*
  - $\omega_i^p = F_i' \in \mathbb{Z}[\zeta + \zeta^{-1}]^*.$
  - $F_i\mathbb{Z}[\zeta] = \mathbf{b}_i^p, \quad Cl(\mathbf{b}_i) \in C_p^-.$
- *In Artin map* $C_p^+ \rightarrow Gal(H^+/K^+)$ *for* $i = 1, \dots, r_p^+$ *then* $< Cl(\mathbf{b}_{r_p^-+i}) > \subset C_p^+$ *corresponds to unramified cyclic extension* $L_i/K^+ = K^+(\omega_i + \overline{\omega_i})/K^+ = K^+(\omega_i + \frac{b_i}{\omega_i})/K^+$ *with:*
  - $\omega_i^p = F_i \in K - K^+, \quad F_i\overline{F_i} = b_i^p, \quad b_i \in K^+.$
  - $F_i\mathbb{Z}[\zeta] = \mathbf{b}_i^p, \quad Cl(\mathbf{b}_i) \in C_p^-.$

Remark: from this result on Artin map, we see that $n^+ = 0$, which allows to simplify in a strong way formulation of the Hilbert class field theorem 57 p. 55 and 4.3 p. 56.

Theorem 5.5. **** With the same global meaning of index* i *in all the theorem, the Hilbert* p*-class field verifies the structure:*

$$\begin{aligned}
&H = \mathbb{Q}(\zeta, \omega_1, \dots, \omega_{r_p}),\\
&\omega_i^p = B_i, \quad B_i \in \mathbb{Z}[\zeta], \quad B_i\mathbb{Z}[\zeta] = \mathbf{b}_i^p, \quad Cl(\mathbf{b}_i) \in C_p^-, \quad i = 1, \dots, r_p^+,\\
&B_i\overline{B}_i = \beta_i^p, \quad \beta_i \in \mathbb{Z}[\zeta + \zeta^{-1}] - \mathbb{Z}[\zeta + \zeta^{-1}]^*, \quad i = 1, \dots, r_p^+,\\
&\omega_i^p \in \mathbb{Z}[\zeta + \zeta^{-1}]^*, \quad i = r_p^+ + 1, \dots, r_p,
\end{aligned} \tag{65}$$

where $B_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, r_p^+$*, are singular primary.*

Theorem 5.6. **** Let* $C_1 =< Cl(\mathbf{b}) >$ *be a subgroup of order* p *of* C_p *with* $\sigma(\mathbf{b}) \simeq \mathbf{b}^\mu, \quad \mu \in \mathbf{F}_p^*$*. Let* $M = \mathbb{Q}(\zeta, \Omega)$ *be the cyclic unramified extension with* $Gal(M/\mathbb{Q}(\zeta))$ *corresponding to* C_1 *by Artin map. Then* $\sigma(\Omega) = \Omega^\nu \times \gamma, \quad \nu \in \mathbf{F}_p^*, \quad \gamma \in \mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$*. Then* $\nu \equiv u \times \mu^{-1}$ *mod* p*.*

Proof.

- By Artin map, $Cl(\mathbf{b})$ corresponds to the $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$-isomorphism $\theta : \Omega \leftrightarrow \Omega\zeta$ of M.
- By Artin map $Cl(\mathbf{b}^\mu)$ corresponds to the $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$-isomorphism $\theta^\mu : \Omega \leftrightarrow \Omega\zeta^\mu$ of M.
- Show that, by Artin map, $Cl(\sigma(\mathbf{b})) = Cl(\mathbf{b}^\mu)$ corresponds to the $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$-isomorphism $\sigma(\Omega) \leftrightarrow \sigma(\Omega\zeta)$ of M:
  - Let $\mathbf{q}$ be a prime of $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$ with $\mathbf{q} \simeq \mathbf{b}$. Let B_M be the ring of integers of M. Let $\mathbf{q}_M$ be a prime of M above $\mathbf{q}$.
  - There exists a Frobenius automorphism Φ_1 generating Galois group of $B_M/\mathbf{q}_M$ over $\mathbb{Z}[\zeta]/\mathbf{q}$ and there exists a Frobenius automorphism Φ_2 generating Galois group of $B_M/\sigma(\mathbf{q}_M)$ over $\mathbb{Z}[\zeta]/\sigma(\mathbf{q})$ with :

    $$\begin{aligned} &\Phi_1(\Omega) = \Omega\zeta \equiv \Omega^q \bmod \mathbf{q}B_M,\\ &\Phi_2(\sigma(\Omega)) \equiv \sigma(\Omega)^q \bmod \sigma(\mathbf{q})B_M,\\ &q = N_{\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)/\mathbb{Q}}(\mathbf{q}) = N_{\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)/\mathbb{Q}}(\sigma(\mathbf{q})), \end{aligned} \tag{66}$$

    (see for instance Marcus, [31] theorem 32 p. 109).
  - This implies that $\Phi_2(\sigma(\Omega))$, of form $\Phi_2(\sigma(\Omega)) = \sigma(\Omega)\zeta^v \quad v \in \mathbb{N}, \quad v \not\equiv 0 \bmod p$, verifies $\Phi_2(\sigma(\Omega)) = \sigma(\Omega)\zeta^v \equiv \sigma(\Omega)^q \bmod \sigma(\mathbf{q})B_M$. But by conjugation, we get also $\sigma(\Omega\zeta) = \sigma(\Omega)\zeta^u \equiv \sigma(\Omega)^q \bmod \sigma(\mathbf{q})B_M$. Therefore $v = u$ and $\Phi_2(\sigma(\Omega)) = \sigma(\Omega)\zeta^u = \sigma(\Omega\zeta)$.
- We have shown that, by Artin map, $Cl(\mathbf{b}^\mu)$ corresponds to the $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$-isomorphism $\sigma(\Omega) \rightarrow \sigma(\Omega)\zeta^u$, thus $\Omega^\nu \leftrightarrow \Omega^\nu\zeta^u$ of M.
- By Artin map, $Cl(\mathbf{b}^\mu)$ corresponds to the $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$-isomorphism $\Omega^\nu \leftrightarrow \Omega^\nu\zeta^{\mu\nu}$ of M. Therefore $\mu\nu \equiv u \bmod p$, which achieves the proof.

□

Remark: Suppose that $h^+ \equiv 0 \bmod p$. Let $\mathbf{b}_+$ be a not principal ideal with $\mathbf{b}_+^p \simeq \mathbb{Z}[\zeta], \quad Cl(\mathbf{b}^+) \in C_p^+$. Let M/K be the cyclic unramified extension of K with $< Cl(\mathbf{b}_+) > \leftrightarrow Gal(M/K)$ by Artin map. In that particular case we have $\mu^{(p-1)/2} = 1$ and so $\nu^{(p-1)/2} = -1$, which corresponds well to the fact that, in that case, $\Omega \in K - K^+$.

6 Connection between roots mod p of Mirimanoff polynomials and p-class group of $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$

Let $b \in \mathbb{N}, \quad 1 < b < p-1$. Let $m \in \mathbb{N}$. Let us note $\phi_m(b)$ the Mirimanoff polynomial value $\phi_m(b) = \sum_{i=1}^{p-1} i^{m-1} \times b^i$. In this subsection we give some arithmetic congruences mod p of Mirimanoff polynomials $\phi_m(b)$, strongly connected to class group structure of the field $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$.

Lemma 6.1. *Let $b \in \mathbb{N}, \quad 1 < b < p-1$. Let $m \in \mathbb{N}, \quad 1 \leq m \leq \frac{p-3}{2}$. Let $D(b, 2m+1) = \prod_{i=0}^{p-2} (\frac{b-\zeta^{u_i}}{b-\zeta^{-u_i}})^{u_{-(2m+1)i}}$.*

1. *If, and only if, $\phi_{2m+1}(b) \not\equiv 0$ mod p then $D(b, 2m+1)$ verifies:*

$$\begin{aligned}
&D(b,2m+1) \notin \mathbb{Q}(\zeta)^p,\\
&\sigma(D(b,2m+1)) = D(b,2m+1)^{u_{2m+1}} \times \gamma^p, \quad \gamma \in \mathbb{Q}(\zeta),\\
&\sigma(D(b,2m+1)) \equiv D(b,2m+1)^{u_{2m+1}} \ mod\ \pi^{p+1},\\
&\pi^{2m+1} \| (D(b,2m+1) - 1).
\end{aligned}$$

2. *If, and only if, $\phi_{2m+1}(b) \equiv 0$ mod p then $D(b, 2m+1) \equiv 1$ mod p.*

Proof. Let us note in the proof D for $D(b, 2m+1)$. Observe at first that $D \neq 1$ and that $D \equiv 1 \text{ mod } \pi$.

- Show at first that $D \notin \mathbb{Q}(\zeta)^p$. Suppose that $D \in \mathbb{Q}(\zeta)^p$ and search for a contradiction: $D \in \mathbb{Q}(\zeta)^p$ should imply that $\prod_{i=0}^{p-2} (\frac{b-\zeta^{u_i}}{b-\zeta^{-u_i}})^{u_{-(2m+1)i}} \equiv 1 \text{ mod } p$. Similarly to foundation theorem 9.1 p. 89 this should imply that $\phi_{2n+1}(b) \times \sum_{i=0}^{p-2} u_{(2n+1-(2m+1))i} \equiv 0 \text{ mod } p$ for $n = 1, \ldots, \frac{p-3}{2}$, and thus $\phi_{2m+1}(b) \equiv 0 \text{ mod } p$, contradicting hypothesis assumed.

- We get

$$\sigma(D) = \prod_{i=0}^{p-2} (\frac{b - \zeta^{u_{i+1}}}{b - \zeta^{-u_{i+1}}})^{u_{-(2m+1)i}}$$

  Let $i' = i + 1$. Then

$$\sigma(D) = \prod_{i'=1}^{p-1} (\frac{b - \zeta^{u_{i'}}}{b - \zeta^{-u_{i'}}})^{u_{-(2m+1)(i'-1)}}.$$

But $u_{-(2m+1)(i'-1)} \equiv u_{-(2m+1)i'} \times u_{2m+1} \bmod p$, so

$$\sigma(D) = \prod_{i'=1}^{p-1} (\frac{b-\zeta^{u_{i'}}}{b-\zeta^{-u_{i'}}})^{u_{-(2m+1)i'} \times u_{2m+1}} \times \gamma^p, \quad \gamma \in \mathbb{Q}(\zeta),$$

$$\sigma(D) \equiv \prod_{i'=1}^{p-1} (\frac{b-\zeta^{u_{i'}}}{b-\zeta^{-u_{i'}}})^{u_{-(2m+1)i'} \times u_{2m+1}} \bmod \pi^{p+1}.$$

Then

$$i' = p-1 \Rightarrow (\frac{b-\zeta^{u_{i'}}}{b-\zeta^{-u_{i'}}})^{u_{-(2m+1)(i'-1)}} = (\frac{b-\zeta}{b-\zeta^{-1}})^{u_{2m+1}}.$$

$$i = 0 \Rightarrow (\frac{b-\zeta^{u_i}}{b-\zeta^{-u_i}})^{u_{-(2m+1)i}} = \frac{b-\zeta}{b-\zeta^{-1}}.$$

Therefore

$$\sigma(D) = D^{u_{2m+1}} \times \gamma^p,$$

$$\sigma(D) = \prod_{i=1}^{p-2} (\frac{b-\zeta^{u_i}}{b-\zeta^{-u_i}})^{u_{-(2m+1)i} \times u_{2m+1}} \times (\frac{b-\zeta}{b-\zeta^{-1}})^{u_{2m+1}} \equiv D^{u_{2m+1}} \bmod \pi^p.$$

$D \equiv 1 \bmod p$ should imply that $\prod_{i=0}^{p-2} (\frac{b-\zeta^{u_i}}{b-\zeta^{-u_i}})^{u_{-(2m+1)i}} \equiv 1 \bmod p$. Similarly to foundation theorem 9.1 p. 89 this should imply that $\phi_{2n+1}(b) \times \sum_{i=0}^{p-2} u_{(2n+1-(2m+1))i} \equiv 0 \bmod p$ for $n = 1, \dots, \frac{p-3}{2}$, and thus $\phi_{2m+1}(b) \equiv 0 \bmod p$, contradicting hypothesis assumed. Similarly to proof of lemma 2.9 p. 28 and remark following this lemma, it implies that $\pi^{2m+1} \| (D(b, 2m+1) - 1)$.

□

Remark: This result generalizes the results obtained in the references:

1. the description of the π-adic structure of the p-class group C_p, seen in subsection 2.4.5 p. 26,
2. the structure of the unit group $\mathbb{Z}[\zeta + \zeta^{-1}]^*$ seen in subsection 3 p. 43, particularly theorem 3.2 p. 45.

Here a generalization to odd and even Mirimanoff polynomial of the previous lemma dealing with odd Mirimanoff polynomials:

Lemma 6.2. *Let* $b \in \mathbb{N}, \quad 1 < b < p-1$. *Let* $m \in \mathbb{N}, \quad 1 < m \leq p-2$. *Let* $D(b, m) = \prod_{i=0}^{p-2} (b - \zeta^{u_i})^{u_{-mi}}$.

1. *If, and only if,* $\phi_m(b) \not\equiv 0$ *mod* p *then* $D(b,m)$ *verifies:*

$$\begin{aligned}
&D(b,m) \notin \mathbb{Q}(\zeta)^p,\\
&\sigma(D(b,m)) = D(b,m)^{u_m} \times \gamma^p, \quad \gamma \in \mathbb{Q}(\zeta),\\
&\sigma(D(b,m)) \equiv D(b,m)^{u_m} \ mod\ \pi^{p+1},\\
&\pi^m \| (D(b,m)-d), \quad d \in \mathbb{Z}, \quad d \not\equiv 0 \ mod\ p.
\end{aligned}$$

2. *If, and only if* $\phi_m(b) \equiv 0$ *mod* p *then* $D(b,m) \equiv d$ *mod* p, $\quad d \in \mathbb{Z}$.

Proof. Same proof as lemma 6.1 p. 68. □

The next theorem connects the existence of some roots b of Mirimanoff polynomials $\phi_n(b) \equiv 0 \bmod p$ to the structure of the p-class group C_p of the field $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$.

Theorem 6.3. **** Suppose that* p *divides the class number* h *of* $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$. *Let* r_p^- *be the relative* p*-class group* C_p^-. *For* $i = 1, \dots, r_p^-$, *there exist different natural integers* $m_i \in \mathbb{N}, \quad 1 \le m_i \le \frac{p-3}{2}$, *and ideals* $\mathbf{b}_i$ *of* $\mathbb{Z}[\zeta], \quad Cl(\mathbf{b}_i) \in C_p^-, \quad \sigma(\mathbf{b}_i) \simeq \mathbf{b}_i^{\mu_i}, \quad \mu_i = u_{2m_i+1}$, *and natural integers* $b_i, \quad 1 < b_i \le p-1$, *verifying Mirimanoff polynomial congruences*

$$\phi_{2m_i+1}(b_i) \times \phi_{p-2m_i-1}(b_i) \equiv 0 \ mod\ p, \quad i = 1, \dots, r_p^-. \tag{67}$$

Proof.

- The existence of the $\mathbf{b}_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, r_p^-$, is shown in relation 14 p. 26. From lemma 2.8 p. 27 there exist, for $i = 1, \dots, r_p^-$, singular $C_i \in \mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$ with $C_i \equiv 1 \bmod \pi, \quad \sigma(C_i) = C_i^{\mu_i} \times \alpha_i^p, \quad \alpha_i \in \mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$.
- If C_i is singular primary, then $C_i \equiv 1 \bmod \pi^p$ and from lemma 6.1 p. 68 there exists at least one $b_i \in \mathbb{N}, \quad 1 < b_i \le p-1$, with $\phi_{2m_i+1}(b_i) \equiv 0 \bmod p$: If $\phi_{2m_i+1}(b_i) \not\equiv 0 \bmod p$ for all $b_i, \quad 1 < b_i \le p-1$, then it should imply that $\pi^{2m_i+1} \| (D(b_i, 2m_i+1) - 1)$ for all $b_i, \quad 1 < b_i \le p-1$, and so, from $C_i \equiv D(b_i, 2m_i+1) \bmod \pi^{p-1}$, we should obtain $\pi^{2m_i+1} \| (C_i - 1)$, contradiction.
- If C_i is singular not primary then from theorem 5.6 p. 66 on class field theory, there exists a primary unit $F_i = \omega_i^p \in \mathbb{Z}[\zeta+\zeta^{-1}]^*$ with $\sigma(F_i) = F_i^{p-2m_i-1} \times \varepsilon_i^p, \quad \varepsilon_i \in \mathbb{Z}[\zeta+\zeta^{-1}]^*$. Then $F_i \equiv c_i^p, \quad c_i \in \mathbb{Z}$. If $\phi_{p-2m_i-1}(b_i) \not\equiv 0 \bmod p$ for all $b_i, \quad 1 < b_i \le p-1$, then, from lemma 6.2 p. 69, it should imply that $\pi^{p-2m_i-1} \| (D(b_i, p-2m_i-1) - 1)$ for all $b_i, \quad 1 < b_i \le p-1$, and so from $F_i \equiv d_i \times D(b_i, p-2m_i-1) \bmod \pi^{p-1}, \quad d_i \in \mathbb{Z}$, that $\pi^{p-2m_i-1} \| (F_i - 1)$, contradiction.

□

PART TWO: ON FERMAT-WILES THEOREM

This section contains a study of Fermat-Wiles equation in first and second case with an elementary approach and with use of results on cyclotomic fields obtained in the the first part of the monography. It contains:

- a study of FLT first case:
  - Several congruences $\mod p$ of Mirimanoff polynomials connected to FLT.
  - Several congruences $\mod p$ of Mirimanoff polynomials connected to FLT in intermediate fields $K, \quad \mathbb{Q} \subset K \subset \mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$.
  - Several strictly elementary congruence criterions.
  - An approach with the point of view of representations of $Gal(\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)/\mathbb{Q})$.
  - An approach with the point of view of Hilbert class field of $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$.
  - A formulation of explicit criterions with Jacobi resolvents method
  - A comparative survey of our results with bibliography
- A study on FLT second case:
  - An elementary approach.
  - A cyclotomic field approach.
  - An Hilbert class field approach.

7 Some preliminaries on FLT

This section contains some definitions on Fermat-Wiles theorem, some general preliminary results and the computation of a rough upper bound of the class number h of $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$ used in the sequel.

7.1 Some definitions on FLT

- For $m = 1, \dots, \frac{p-3}{2}$, the polynomials

  $$\phi_{2m+1}(T) = 1^{2m} \times T + 2^{2m} \times T^2 + \dots + (p-1)^{2m} \times T^{p-1}$$

  are the odd Mirimanoff polynomials of the indeterminate T.

- Let us denote $x^p + y^p + z^p = 0$ the Fermat equation, where, as usual, $x \in \mathbb{Z} - \{0\}, \quad y \in \mathbb{Z} - \{0\}, \quad z \in \mathbb{Z} - \{0\}$, and x, y, z are pairwise coprime. In all the sequel of this monograph , x, y, z are the solutions of the Fermat equation. Let ζ be a root of the equation $\frac{X^p-1}{X-1} = 0$. Classically, we have

  $$\begin{aligned} &(x + \zeta^i y)\mathbb{Z}[\zeta] = \pi^\delta \mathbf{s}_i^p, \quad i = 1, \dots, p-1, \\ &\delta = 0 \text{ if } z \not\equiv 0 \text{ mod } p, \\ &\delta = 1 \text{ if } z \equiv 0 \text{ mod } p. \end{aligned} \tag{68}$$

  where $\mathbf{s}_i$ is an integral ideal of $\mathbb{Z}[\zeta]$. Recall that, when $\mathbf{s}_1$ is a principal ideal, there is a classical proof of the first case of Fermat's Last Theorem.

- In the sequel, we shall use the classical acronym FLT for Fermat's Last Theorem or now Fermat-Wiles Theorem.

- The Fermat equation can be written

  $$\prod_{i=0}^{p-1} (x + \zeta^i y) + z^p = 0.$$

  It is always possible to choose the pair $\{x, y\} \subset \{x, y, z\}$ such that $x \not\equiv y$ mod p.

  - It is clear if $z \equiv 0$ mod p.
  - If $xyz \not\equiv 0$ mod p, from $p > 5$ assumed, it is always possible to choose a pair (x, y) such that $x \not\equiv y$ mod p, because $x \equiv y \equiv z$ mod p would imply that $p = 3$.

  It is important to note that in the sequel of this article,we suppose that $x \not\equiv y$ mod p.

- In all the sequel of this monograph, let us denote $t \in \mathbb{N}$ for $t \equiv -\frac{x}{y} \mod p, \quad 0 \leq t \leq p-1$. In first case of FLT, we can assume that t does not belong to the set of three values $\{0, 1, p-1\}$.
- $t = 0$ would imply $x \equiv 0 \mod p$.
- $t = p-1$ would imply $y \equiv x \mod p$ excluded by previous bullet item.
- $t = 1$ would imply $x + y \equiv 0 \mod p$ and so $z \equiv 0 \mod p$.

Remark: In almost all the results of this article, we assume only relation (68) corresponding to the diophantine equation in $\mathbb{Z}$, for $x, y \in \mathbb{Z} - \{0\}$ mutually co-prime,

$$\frac{x^p + y^p}{x + y} = p^\delta t_1^p, \quad t_1 \in \mathbb{Z}, \quad \delta \in \{0, 1\}. \tag{69}$$

The Fermat equation $x^p + y^p + z^p = 0$ implies diophantine equation (69), but the converse is false. In that meaning, almost our results deal with a wider set of diophantine equations than the Fermat equation. This remark is detailed in the section 18 p. 193 dealing on the first case of the Generalized Fermat-Wiles equation $x^p + y^p + c \times z^p = 0, \quad xy \times (x^2 - y^2) \not\equiv 0 \mod p$ and the partial Barlow equation $\frac{x^p + y^p}{x+y} = t_1^p, \quad xy(x^2 - y^2) \not\equiv 0 \mod p$.

7.2 Preliminary results

This section contains some elementary congruences $\mod p$ in $\mathbb{Z}[\zeta]$ and an upper bound estimate of the class number of $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$.

7.2.1 Elementary congruences mod p in $\mathbb{Z}[\zeta]$

Proposition 1. *Let $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{Z}(\zeta)$ with $\alpha \not\equiv 0 \mod \pi$ and $\alpha \equiv \beta$ mod π. Then $\alpha^p \equiv \beta^p$ mod π^{p+1}.*

Proof. Let $\lambda = (\zeta - 1)$. We have $\alpha - \beta \equiv 0 \mod \pi \Rightarrow (\alpha - \zeta^k \beta) \equiv 0 \mod \pi$ for $k = 0, 1, \ldots, p-1$. Therefore, for all $k, \quad 0 \leq k \leq p-1$, there exists $a_k \in \mathbb{N}, \quad 0 \leq a_k \leq p-1$, such that $(\alpha - \zeta^k \beta) \equiv \lambda a_k \mod \pi^2$. For another value $l, \quad 0 \leq l \leq p-1$, we have, in the same way, $(\alpha - \zeta^l \beta) \equiv \lambda a_l \mod \pi^2$, hence $(\zeta^k - \zeta^l)\beta \equiv \lambda(a_k - a_l) \mod \pi^2$. For $k \neq l$ we get $a_k \neq a_l$, because $\pi \| (\zeta^k - \zeta^l)$ and because hypothesis $\alpha \not\equiv 0 \mod \pi$ implies that $\beta \not\equiv 0 \mod \pi$. Therefore, there exists one and only one k such that $(\alpha - \zeta^k \beta) \equiv 0 \mod \pi^2$. Then, we have $\prod_{j=0}^{p-1}(\alpha - \zeta^j \beta) = (\alpha^p - \beta^p) \equiv 0 \mod \pi^{p+1}$. $\square$

Remark: The slight improvement in π^2, comparing with the result $\alpha^p \equiv \beta^p \bmod pZ[\zeta] = \pi^{p-1}$, quoted in the literature, will be used for the proof of second case of Fermat's Last Theorem when $p \parallel y$, see thm 19.1 p. 197.

Corollary 7.1. *Let* $\alpha \in \mathbb{Z}[\zeta], \quad \alpha \not\equiv 0$ *mod* π. *Then, there exists* $b \in \mathbb{Z}$ *such that* $\alpha^p \equiv b^p \mod \pi^{p+1}$ *where* $b \in \mathbb{Z}$.

Proof. Immediate consequence of proposition 1 p. 73 where there exists $b \in \mathbb{Z}$ with $b \equiv \beta \bmod \pi$. ☐

Remark: This result is a slight improvement in π^2 of the result quoted in the literature : $a^p \equiv b \mod p$, see for instance Washington [68], lem. 1.8 p 5. In a former version, we have shown $\alpha^p \equiv b \bmod \pi^p$. Professor G. Terjanian mentionned us the improvement up to corollary 7.1 p.74.

7.2.2 An upper bound estimate of the class number of the cyclotomic field

In the next theorem, we compute an explicit rough upper bound of the class number of $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$. This one shall be used in the sequel of this article.

Lemma 7.2. *Let* h *be the class number of* $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$. *Then* $h < p^{p-2}$.

Proof. Recall that in this paper, we assume $p > 5$. Let $h = h^* \times h^+$ be the class number of $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$ where h^* is the first factor and h^+ is the second factor. From Ribenboim([39]) p 132, derived from Lepisto and Metsankyla, formula 6.7

$$h^* < 2p \times (\frac{p}{24})^{(p-1)/4}.$$

From ([39]) formula 1.24 p 97,

$$h^+ = \frac{2^{(p-3)/2}}{R} \times \prod_{k=1}^{(p-3)/2} | \sum_{j=0}^{(p-3)/2} \eta^{2kj} log|1 - \zeta^{g^j}||,$$

where $\eta \in \mathbb{C}$ is a $(p-1)$-primitive root of 1, $\quad g \in \mathbb{N}$ is a primitive root $\mod p$ and $R \in \mathbb{R}_+$ is the Regulator of $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$. Zimmert has shown in [72] corollary p 375, that for a number field K of signature (r_1, r_2), of Regulator R, which contains w roots of unity, we have the inequality $2\frac{R}{w} \geq 0.04 \times exp(0.46r_1 + 0.1r_2)$. Then, for the cyclotomic field $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$, we have $w = 2p$, $r_1 = 0$, $r_2 = \frac{p-1}{2}$ and $R > 0.04 \times \frac{w}{2} \times exp(0.1\frac{(p-1)}{2})$; thus

$R > 0.04 \times p \times exp(0.1 \times \frac{(p-1)}{2})$. We have the rough estimate $|\eta^{2kj} \times log|1 - \zeta^{g^j}|| = |log|1 - \zeta^{g^j}|| < log(p)$ because $p > 5$. Therefore,

$$h^+ < \frac{2^{(p-3)/2}}{(0.04 \times p \times exp(0.1 \times \frac{(p-1)}{2}))} \times (\frac{(p-1)}{2} log(p))^{(p-3)/2}.$$

From these upper bounds of h^* and of h^+ we get

$$h < Q(p) = \{2p \times (\frac{p}{24})^{(p-1)/4}\} \times \frac{2^{(p-3)/2}}{(0.04 \times p \times exp(0.1 \times \frac{(p-1)}{2}))} \times (\frac{(p-1)}{2} log(p))^{(p-3)/2}.$$

A rough calculation shows that $Q(p) < p^{p-2}$ for all primes $p > 5$. ☐

8 FLT first case: Some congruences mod p

In this section, we study the first case : we suppose that $xyz \not\equiv 0 \bmod p$. Our method is similar to Eichler's method in ([10]) and ([39]). Implicitly, we suppose that $e_p < p-2$, a result that we have proved in theorem 7.2 p. 74. The next subsection gives principle of the method to obtain congruences mod p connected to FLT.

8.1 Principle of the method

This lemma is purely technical and does not take part in the method.

Lemma 8.1. *Let* $g \in \mathbb{N}, \quad 1 \leq g \leq p-1$. *Then* $(x+\zeta^g y)\mathbb{Z}[\zeta]$ *has at least one prime divisor different of* π.

Proof. From $xyz \not\equiv 0 \bmod p$, we deduce that $x+y \not\equiv 0 \bmod \pi$. It is enough to prove that $(x+\zeta^g y) \notin \mathbb{Z}[\zeta]^*$. Suppose that $(x+\zeta^g y) \in \mathbb{Z}[\zeta]^*$ and search for a contradiction: then, we have $\frac{x^p+y^p}{x+y} = \pm 1$, hence $(x^p+y^p) = \pm(x+y)$. In an other part, we have $x^p+y^p \equiv x+y \bmod p$. From these two relations, we obtain $x^p+y^p = x+y$. If $\frac{x}{y} > 0$, this relation is clearly impossible because we not have $|x| = |y| = 1$. Then, suppose that $\frac{x}{y} < 0$. Suppose, without loss of generality, that $-1 < \frac{x}{y} < 0$ and $x > 0$: consider the function $f(u) = x^u - (-y)^u - x - y$ of the variable $u \in \mathbb{R}, \quad u \geq 1$. We have $f(1) = 0$ and $f'_u(u) = u(x^{u-1} - (-y)^{u-1}) > 0$ for $1 < u < \infty$ and therefore $f(u) \neq 0$ and thus $x^p + y^p \neq x+y$. □

The next proposition gives the elementary principle of the method.

Proposition 2. *Let* $h = p^{e_p} \times h_2, \quad h_2 \not\equiv 0$ *mod* p, *be the class number of* $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)/\mathbb{Q}$. *Let* $f \in \mathbb{N}, \quad p-1 \geq f \geq e_p + 2$. *Let* I_f *be* **any** *set of* f *natural distinct numbers*

$$I_f = \{g_i \quad | \quad g_i \in \mathbb{N}, \quad i = 1, \dots, f, \quad 1 \leq g_i \leq p-1\} \tag{70}$$

such that the two sets I_f *and* $I'_f = \{p - g_i \quad | \quad i = 1, \dots, f\}$ *are not equal.*

Then, there exists at least one set of f *natural numbers* $L(I_f)$, *not all simultaneously null,*

$$L(I_f) = \{ \ l_i \ | \quad l_i \in \mathbb{N}, \quad 1 \leq i \leq f, \quad 0 \leq l_i \leq p-1 \ \} \tag{71}$$

such that simultaneously,

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\prod_{i=1}^{f}(x+\zeta^{g_i}y)^{l_i}=\eta\times\gamma^p, \quad \gamma\in\mathbb{Z}[\zeta], \quad \eta\in\mathbb{Z}[\zeta+\zeta^{-1}]^*,\\
&\prod_{i=1}^{f}\Big(\frac{(x+\zeta^{g_i}y)}{(x+\zeta^{-g_i}y)}\Big)^{l_i}=\Big(\frac{\gamma}{\overline{\gamma}}\Big)^p,\\
&\prod_{i=1}^{f}(x+\zeta^{g_i}y)^{l_i}-\prod_{i=1}^{f}(x+\zeta^{-g_i}y)^{l_i}\neq 0,\\
&\prod_{i=1}^{f}(x+\zeta^{g_i}y)^{l_i}-\prod_{i=1}^{f}(x+\zeta^{-g_i}y)^{l_i}\equiv 0 \ mod\ \pi^{p+1}.
\end{aligned}
\tag{72}
$$

Proof. From theorem 7.2 p. 74, we have $e_p<p-2$. Let I_f be a set verifying relation 70 p. 76. Consider the set P of algebraic numbers defined by

$$P=\{\prod_{i=1}^{f}(x+\zeta^{g_i}y)^{m_i} \quad | \quad 0\leq m_i\leq p-1 \quad ,m_i \text{ not all } 0\}.$$

We have $(x+\zeta^{g_i}y)\mathbb{Z}[\zeta]=\mathbf{s}_{g_i}^p$ where $\mathbf{s}_{g_i}, \quad i=1,\dots,f$, is an integral ideal of $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$. Consider the set $E=\{\prod_{i=1}^{f}\mathbf{s}_{g_i}^{m_i} \quad | \quad 0\leq m_i\leq p-1, \quad m_i \text{ not all } 0\}$. We have $Card(E)=p^f-1\geq p^{e_p+2}-1>p^{e_p+1}$. Therefore, from Dirichlet boxes principle, there exists a subset E_0 of E with at least $p+1$ ideals $\mathbf{a}_j, \quad j=1,\dots,p+1$, having the same $p-$component in the class group $Cl(\mathbb{Q}(\zeta))$. For each pair $(\mathbf{a}_1,\mathbf{a}_j)\subset E_0, \quad j=2,\dots,p+1$, we can write , from classical factorization of Fermat equation in the cyclotomic field,

$$
\begin{aligned}
&P_1=\prod_{i=1}^{f}(x+\zeta^{g_i}y)^{m_i}\mathbb{Z}[\zeta]=\mathbf{a}_1^p, \quad m_i \text{ not all } 0,\\
&P_j=\prod_{i=1}^{f}(x+\zeta^{g_{i,j}}y)^{n_{i,j}}\mathbb{Z}[\zeta]=\mathbf{a}_j^p, \quad n_{i,j} \text{ not all } 0, \quad j=2,\dots,p+1,
\end{aligned}
\tag{73}
$$

where the two integral ideals $\mathbf{a}_1$ and $\mathbf{a}_j, \quad j=2,\dots,p+1$, are in the same class of the class group of $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$, so $\frac{\mathbf{a}_1}{\mathbf{a}_j}=\gamma_j\mathbb{Z}[\zeta], \quad \gamma_j\in\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$. Therefore, we have

$$\prod_{i=1}^{f}\frac{(x+\zeta^{g_i}y)^{n_{i,j}}}{(x+\zeta^{g_i}y)^{m_i}}=\varepsilon_j\times\gamma_j^p, \quad \varepsilon_j\in\mathbb{Z}[\zeta]^*.$$

From Kummer's lemma, we have $\varepsilon_j = \zeta^{v_j} \times \eta_j$, where $v_j \in \mathbb{N}, \quad 0 \leq v_j \leq p-1$, and where $\eta_j \in \mathbb{Z}[\zeta+\zeta^{-1}]^*$. Therefore, we deduce that

$$\prod_{i=1}^{f} \frac{(x+\zeta^{g_i}y)^{n_{i,j}}}{(x+\zeta^{g_i}y)^{m_i}} = \zeta^{v_j} \times \eta_j \times \gamma_j^p.$$

Because there are more than p different ideals $\mathbf{a}$ defined by relation (73) p. 77 in the same class, there are at least two different pairs of ideals $(\mathbf{a}_1, \mathbf{a}_j), \quad (\mathbf{a}_1, \mathbf{a}_{j'})$ with the same v. Therefore, we have

$$\prod_{i=1}^{f} \frac{(x+\zeta^{g_i}y)^{n_{i,j'}}}{(x+\zeta^{g_i}y)^{m_i}} = \zeta^{v_j} \times \eta_{j'} \times \gamma_{j'}^p, \quad \eta_{j'} \in \mathbb{Z}[\zeta+\zeta^{-1}]^*, \quad \gamma_{j'} \in \mathbb{Q}(\zeta),$$

hence

$$\prod_{i=1}^{f} (x+\zeta^{g_i}y)^{n_{i,j}-n_{i,j'}} = \eta_1 \times \gamma_1^p, \quad n_{i,j}-n_{i,j'} \text{ not all } 0,$$
$$\eta_1 \in \mathbb{Z}[\zeta+\zeta^{-1}]^*, \quad \gamma_1 \in \mathbb{Z}(\zeta).$$

Therefore, there exists a set $L(I_f) = \{l_i \quad | \quad i \in I_f, \quad 0 \leq l_i \leq p-1 \quad \}$, where the l_i are not all simultaneously null, such that

$$\prod_{i=1}^{f} (x+\zeta^{g_i}y)^{l_i} = \eta_1 \times \gamma_1^p, \quad \eta_1 \in \mathbb{Z}[\zeta+\zeta^{-1}]^*, \quad \gamma_1 \in \mathbb{Z}[\zeta].$$

Then, we have

$$\prod_{i=1}^{f} (x+\zeta^{-g_i}y)^{l_i} = \eta_1 \times \overline{\gamma_1^p},$$
$$\prod_{i=1}^{f} \left(\frac{(x+\zeta^{g_i}y)}{(x+\zeta^{-g_i}y)}\right)^{l_i} = \left(\frac{\gamma_1}{\overline{\gamma_1}}\right)^p.$$

From proposition 1 p.73 we deduce that

$$\prod_{i=1}^{f} (x+\zeta^{g_i}y)^{l_i} - \prod_{i=1}^{f} (x+\zeta^{-g_i}y)^{l_i} \equiv 0 \text{ mod } \pi^{p+1}.$$

Show that we have :

$$A = \prod_{i=1}^{f} (x+\zeta^{g_i}y)^{l_i} - \prod_{i=1}^{f} (x+\zeta^{-g_i}y)^{l_i} \neq 0.$$

equivalent to

$$\prod_{i=1}^{f}(x+\zeta^{g_i}y)^{l_i}-\prod_{i=1}^{f}(x+\zeta^{p-g_i}y)^{l_i}\neq 0.$$

Suppose that $A=0$ and search for a contradiction: from hypothesis on I_f, we have $\{g_1,g_2,\dots,g_f\}\neq\{p-g_1,p-g_2,\dots,p-g_f\}$; therefore there exists $i,\quad 1\leq i\leq f$ with $g_i\notin\{p-g_1,\dots,p-g_f\}$. For this g_i, from lemma(8.1), there exists $\theta\in\{p-g_j\quad|\quad j=1,\dots,f\},\quad g_i\neq\theta$ and a prime ideal $\mathbf{q}\neq\pi$ of $\mathbb{Z}[\zeta]$ such that $(x+\zeta^{g_i}y)\equiv(x+\zeta^{\theta}y)\equiv 0\text{ mod }\mathbf{q}$, so $(\zeta^{g_i}-\zeta^{\theta})y\equiv 0\text{ mod }\mathbf{q}$, hence $y\equiv 0\text{ mod }\mathbf{q}$, so $x\equiv 0\text{ mod }\mathbf{q}$, contradiction, because x and y are coprime. □

Theorem 8.2. **** Let $h=p^{e_p}\times h_2,\quad h_2\not\equiv 0\ mod\, p$, be the class number of $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)/\mathbb{Q}$. Let $f\in\mathbb{N},\quad p-1\geq f\geq\ min(e_p+2,\frac{p-1}{2})$. Let I_f be* **any** *set of f distinct natural numbers*

$$I_f=\{g_i\quad|\quad g_i\in\mathbb{N},\quad i=1,\dots,f,\quad 1\leq g_i\leq p-1\}. \tag{74}$$

such that the sets I_f and $I'_f=\{p-g_i\quad|\quad i=1,\dots,f\}$ are not equal. Then, there exists at least one set of f natural numbers $L(I_f)$ not all simultaneously null

$$L(I_f)=\{\ l_i\ |\quad l_i\in\mathbb{N},\quad 1\leq i\leq f,\quad 0\leq l_i\leq p-1\ \} \tag{75}$$

such that simultaneously,

$$\prod_{i=1}^{f}(\frac{(x+\zeta^{g_i}y)}{(x+\zeta^{-g_i}y)})^{l_i}=\beta^p,\quad\beta\in\mathbb{Q}(\zeta),\quad\beta\neq 1,$$
$$\prod_{i=1}^{f}(x+\zeta^{g_i}y)^{l_i}-\prod_{i=1}^{f}(x+\zeta^{-g_i}y)^{l_i}\equiv 0\ mod\ \pi^{p+1}.$$

Proof. If $f\leq\frac{p-1}{2}$ in the proposition 2 p. 76, the theorem is proved. If $f>\frac{p-1}{2}$ in the relation (72) p. 77 of proposition 2 p. 76, then $\prod_{i=1}^{f}(x+\zeta^{g_i}y)^{l_i}$ has some factors of the form

$(x+\zeta^{g_i}y)(x+\zeta^{-g_i}y)$ and also $\prod_{i=1}^{f}(x+\zeta^{-g_i}y)^{l_i}$ has the same factors of the form $(x+\zeta^{g_i}y)(x+\zeta^{-g_i}y)$. It is then possible to simplify all such factors in relation (72)

p. 77 of proposition 2 such that we have, with $f' \leq \frac{p-1}{2}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\prod_{i=1}^{f'}(x+\zeta^{g_i}y)^{l_i} - \prod_{i=1}^{f'}(x+\zeta^{-g_i}y)^{l_i} \neq 0,\\
&\prod_{i=1}^{f'}(\frac{(x+\zeta^{g_i}y)}{(x+\zeta^{-g_i}y)})^{l_i} = \beta^p, \quad \beta \in \mathbb{Q}(\zeta), \quad \beta \neq 1,\\
&\prod_{i=1}^{f'}(x+\zeta^{g_i}y)^{l_i} - \prod_{i=1}^{f'}(x+\zeta^{-g_i}y)^{l_i} \equiv 0 \bmod \pi^{p+1}.
\end{aligned}$$

□

Remarks:

- Note that this definition of f, I_f and $L(I_f)$ is suitable in all the sequel of this article.
- It is possible to find "many" sets I_f verifying the hypothesis of proposition 2 p. 76. For instance, all the sets I_f defined by

  $$\{g_1, \dots, g_{f-1}, g_f = p-1 \quad | \quad 2 \leq g_1 < g_2 < \dots < g_{f-1} < g_f = p-1\}$$

  verify the hypothesis : if not, $I_f = I'_f$ with $g_f = p-1$ would imply $p - g_f = 1 \in I_f$ which contradicts $1 \notin I_f = \{g_1, g_2, \dots, g_f\}$.
- Observe that it is possible to replace e_p by $e_p^- \leq e_p$ in theorem 8.2 p.79, because components of the p-class group C_p^+ does not intervene in fractions $\frac{x+\zeta^{g_i}y}{x+\zeta^{-g_i}y}$.

8.2 Definitions and notations

Here, we fix some notations used in the sequel of this paper.

$$\begin{aligned}
&f \in \mathbb{N}, \quad p-1 \geq f \geq min(e_p+2, \frac{p-1}{2}),\\
&I_f = \{g_i \quad | \quad g_i \in \mathbb{N}, \quad 1 \leq g_i \leq p-1, \quad i = 1, \dots, f\}, \quad Card(I_f) = f,\\
&I'_f = \{p - g_i \quad | \quad g_i \in I_f, \quad i = 1, \dots, f\}, \quad I_f \neq I'_f \quad \text{assumed}\\
&L(I_f) \quad \text{defined in proposition 2 p.76.}
\end{aligned}$$

Let us define, for the indeterminate X, the product $P_L(X)=\prod_{i=1}^{f}(x+X^{g_i}y)^{l_i}$. Then, we have $P_L(X^{-1})=\prod_{i=1}^{f}(x+X^{-g_i}y)^{l_i}$. We have

$$P_L(\zeta)=\prod_{i=1}^{f}(x+\zeta^{g_i}y)^{l_i},$$
$$P_L(\zeta^{-1})=\overline{P_L(\zeta)}=\prod_{i=1}^{f}(x+\zeta^{-g_i}y)^{l_i}.$$

Let us denote also

$$Q_L(\zeta)=\prod_{i=1}^{f}(y+\zeta^{g_i}x)^{l_i},$$
$$Q_L(\zeta^{-1})=\overline{Q_L(\zeta)}=\prod_{i=1}^{f}(y+\zeta^{-g_i}x)^{l_i}.$$

where $f, I_f, L(I_f)$ are defined in proposition 2 p.76 and theorem 8.2 p. 79. For this set $L(I_f)$, let $S_j(I_f),\quad j=1,\dots,p-1,\quad S_j(I_f)\in\mathbb{N},\quad 0\le S_j(I_f)\le p-1$, be the functions defined by

$$\begin{aligned}
&S_1(I_f)=\sum_{i=1}^{f} l_i\times g_i \bmod p,\\
&S_2(I_f)=\sum_{i=1}^{f} l_i\times (g_i)^2 \bmod p,\\
&S_3(I_f)=\sum_{i=1}^{f} l_i\times (g_i)^3 \bmod p,\\
&\vdots
\end{aligned}\tag{76}$$

Let $\lambda=\zeta-1$. We have $\zeta^{g_i}=(\lambda+1)^{g_i}\Rightarrow\zeta^{g_i}\equiv(1+\lambda\times g_i)\bmod\pi^2$, $\zeta^{g_i}\equiv(1+\lambda\times g_i+\lambda^2\times\frac{g_i(g_i-1)}{2})\bmod\pi^3,\dots$. In the same way, we have $\zeta^{-g_i}=\zeta^{p-g_i}=(\lambda+1)^{p-g_i}$, hence $\zeta^{-g_i}\equiv(1+\lambda(p-g_i))\bmod\pi^2$, also $\zeta^{-g_i}\equiv(1-\lambda\times g_i)\bmod\pi^2$ and $\zeta^{-g_i}\equiv(1-\lambda\times g_i+\lambda^2\times\frac{g_i(g_i+1)}{2})\bmod\pi^3,\dots$.

8.3 Some general congruences $\bmod\ \pi^\nu$ in $\mathbb{Z}[\zeta]$.

Let $F(X)\in\mathbb{Z}[X]$ where X is an indeterminate. In this section, we note $F'_X(X)$ the derivative polynomial of $F(X)$ for the indeterminate X. Observe that this section is a purely technical intermediate result.

Lemma 8.3. *Let* $\mu, \quad \mu \in \mathbb{N}, \quad 0 < \mu \leq p-1$. *Let* $F[X] \in \mathbb{Z}[X]$, *where* X *is an indeterminate. If* $F(\zeta) \equiv 0 \ mod\ \pi^{\mu}$, *then* $F'_X(\zeta) \equiv 0 \ mod\ \pi^{\mu-1}$. *Moreover, if* $0 < \mu < p-1$ *and* $\pi^{\mu} \| F(\zeta)$ *then* $\pi^{\mu-1} \| F'_X(\zeta)$.

Proof. We have $F(\zeta) \equiv 0 \mod \pi^{\mu}$, so

$(1-\zeta)^{p-1-\mu} F(\zeta) \equiv 0 \mod \pi^{p-1}$, same as $(1-\zeta)^{p-1-\mu} F(\zeta) \equiv 0 \mod p$, so $(1-\zeta)^{p-1-\mu} F(\zeta) = p \times f(\zeta)$ with $f(X) \in \mathbb{Z}[X]$, hence $(1-X)^{p-1-\mu} F(X) = p \times f(X) + \Phi(X) \times h(X)$, where $h(X) \in \mathbb{Z}[X]$ and $\Phi(X)$ is the p-cyclotomic polynomial $\frac{X^p-1}{X-1}$. By derivation of this relation, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & -(p-1-\mu) \times (1-X)^{p-1-\mu-1} \times F(X) + (1-X)^{p-1-\mu} \times F'_X(X) = \\ & p \times f'_X(X) + \Phi'_X(X) \times h(X) + \Phi(X) \times h'_X(X). \end{aligned}$$

We have $\Phi(\zeta) = 0$ and $\Phi'_X(\zeta) \equiv 0 \mod \pi^{p-2}$, hence

$$-(p-1-\mu)(1-\zeta)^{p-1-\mu-1} \times F(\zeta) + (1-\zeta)^{p-1-\mu} F'_X(\zeta) \equiv 0 \mod \pi^{p-2},$$

same as

$$-(p-1-\mu) F(\zeta) + (1-\zeta) F'_X(\zeta) \equiv 0 \mod \pi^{p-2-(p-1-\mu-1)},$$

so

$$-(p-1-\mu) F(\zeta) + (1-\zeta) F'_X(\zeta) \equiv 0 \mod \pi^{\mu}, \tag{77}$$

hence

$$(1-\zeta) F'_X(\zeta) \equiv 0 \mod \pi^{\mu}$$

and finally

$$F'_X(\zeta) \equiv 0 \mod \pi^{\mu-1}.$$

From equation (77) p.82, we deduce immediatly that if $\pi^{\mu} \| F(\zeta)$ then $\pi^{\mu-1} \| F'_X(\zeta)$, which achieves the proof. □

Lemma 8.4. *Let* $G(X) = \frac{F(X)}{H(X)}$ *where* $F(X), H(X) \in \mathbb{Z}[X]$. *If* $F(\zeta) \equiv 0 \ mod\ \pi^{\mu}, \quad 0 < \mu \leq (p-1)$ *and* $H(\zeta) \not\equiv 0 \ mod\ \pi$ *then* $G'_X(\zeta) \equiv 0 \ mod\ \pi^{\mu-1}$.

Proof. From hypothesis, $F(\zeta) \equiv 0 \mod \pi^{\mu}$. Then $G'_X(\zeta) = \frac{F'_X(\zeta)}{H(\zeta)} - \frac{F(\zeta) H'_X(\zeta)}{H(\zeta)^2}$, so $G'_X(\zeta) = \frac{F'_X(\zeta) H(\zeta) - F(\zeta) H'_X(\zeta)}{H(\zeta)^2}$, and finally $G'_X(\zeta) \equiv 0 \mod \pi^{\mu-1}$. □

Lemma 8.5. *Let* $F(X) = \sum c_i X^i \in \mathbb{Q}[X], \quad v_p(c_i) \geq 0$, *of the indeterminate* X. *If* $F(\zeta) \equiv 0 \ mod\ \pi^p$ *and if* $F(1) \equiv 0 \ mod\ p^2$ *then* $F'_X(\zeta) \equiv 0 \ mod\ \pi^{p-1}$.

Proof. From hypothesis we get

$$\begin{aligned}
&F(\zeta) = p \times G(\zeta) \times (\zeta - 1),\\
&G(\zeta) = \sum_{i=0}^{p-2} g_i \zeta^i, \quad v_p(g_i) \geq 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Algebraically we get

$$\begin{aligned}
&F(X) = p \times G(X) \times (X - 1) + h(X) \times \Phi_p(X),\\
&h(X) \in \mathbb{Q}[X], \quad h(X) = \sum h_i X^i, \quad v_p(h_i) \geq 0,\\
&\Phi_p(X) = X^{p-1} + X^{p-2} + \cdots + X + 1.
\end{aligned}$$

We derive that

$$F(X) = p \times G(X) \times (X - 1) + (h(X) - h(1)) \times \Phi_p(X) + h(1) \times \Phi_p(X),$$

also that

$$\begin{aligned}
&F(X) = p \times G(X) \times (X - 1) + h_1(X) \times (X^p - 1) + h(1) \times \Phi_p(X),\\
&h_1(X) \in \mathbb{Q}(X), \quad v_p(h_{1,i}) \geq 0.
\end{aligned}$$

But $F(1) \equiv 0 \text{ mod } p^2$ implies that $h(1) \equiv 0 \text{ mod } p$ because $\Phi_p(1) = p$. By derivation we get

$$\begin{aligned}
&F'_X(X) = p \times G'_X(X) \times (X - 1) + p \times G(X)\\
&+ h'_1(X) \times (X^p - 1) + h_1(X) \times p \times X^{p-1} + h(1) \times \Phi'_p(X),
\end{aligned}$$

which leads to $F'_X(\zeta) \equiv 0 \text{ mod } \pi^{p-1}$. □

Remark: This improvement $F'_X(\zeta) \equiv \pi^{p-1}$ instead of $F'_X(\zeta) \equiv 0 \text{ mod } \pi^{p-2}$ derived from lemma 8.4 p. 82 shall be of great importance in the sequel of this monograph.

8.4 Congruences mod p connected to sums $\sum_{i=1}^{f} \frac{g_i l_i}{(x+\zeta^{g_i} y)}$.

In this subsection, we transform the congruences mod π^{p-1} related to products $\prod_{i=1}^{f}(x + \zeta^{g_i} y)^{l_i}$ in congruences mod π^{p-1} related to sums $\sum_{i=1}^{f} \frac{g_i l_i}{(x+\zeta^{g_i} y)}$.

Lemma 8.6. *Let $P'_{L,X=\zeta}(X)$ be the value of the derivative in the inderminate X of $P_L(X)$ for the value $X = \zeta$. Let $P'_{L,X=\zeta}(X^{-1})$ be the value of the derivative in the inderminate X of $P_L(X^{-1})$ for the value $X = \zeta$. Then*

$$P'_{L,X=\zeta}(X) - P'_{L,X=\zeta}(X^{-1}) \equiv 0 \text{ mod } \pi^{p-1}.$$

Proof. From proposition 2 p.76, we have
$P_L(\zeta) - \overline{P_L(\zeta)} \equiv P_L(\zeta) - P_L(\zeta^{-1}) \equiv 0 \bmod \pi^{p+1}$,
$P_L(\zeta) - P_L(\zeta^{-1}) = p \times (1-\zeta)^2 \times f(\zeta)$,
$f(\zeta) \in \mathbb{Z}[\zeta]$.

Therefore, $P_L(X) - P_L(X^{-1}) = p \times (1-X)^2 \times f(X) + h(X) \times \Phi(X)$, $f(X) \in \mathbb{Z}[X]$, $h(X) = \frac{h_1(X)}{X^u}$, $h_1(X) \in \mathbb{Z}[X]$, $u \in \mathbb{N}$, $\Phi(X) \in \mathbb{Z}[X]$, $\Phi(X) = \frac{(X^p-1)}{(X-1)}$, p-cyclotomic polynomial. We have $P_L(1) - P_L(1^{-1}) = 0$, therefore we deduce the relation

$$P_L(X) - P_L(X^{-1}) = p \times (1-X)^2 \times f(X) + \frac{h_2(X)(1-X)}{X^u} \times \Phi(X),$$

which leads to

$$P_L(X) - P_L(X^{-1}) = p \times (1-X)^2 \times f(X) + \frac{h_2(X)}{X^u} \times (X^p - 1). \tag{78}$$

The proof is similar to proposition 8.3 p.82, noticing that, here, $(X^p-1)'_X = p \times X^{p-1} \equiv 0 \bmod \pi^{p-1}$. ☐

Lemma 8.7. *For $S_1(I_f)$ defined in relation (76) p.81, we have $S_1(I_f) \equiv 0$ mod p.*

Proof.

$$\prod_{i=1}^{f}(x+\zeta^{g_i}y)^{l_i} - \prod_{i=1}^{f}(x+\zeta^{-g_i}y)^{l_i} \equiv 0 \bmod \pi^{p+1}.$$

From previous notations,

$$\begin{aligned}
&(x+\zeta^{g_i}y)^{l_i} \equiv (x+y+y(\zeta^{g_i}-1))^{l_i}\\
&\equiv (x+y)^{l_i} + (x+y)^{l_i-1} y g_i l_i \lambda \bmod \pi^2,\\
&(x+\zeta^{-g_i}y)^{l_i} \equiv (x+y+y(\zeta^{-g_i}-1))^{l_i}\\
&\equiv (x+y)^{l_i} + (x+y)^{l_i-1} y(-g_i) l_i \lambda \bmod \pi^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Denote $S_0(I_f) \in \mathbb{Z}$ the sum $S_0(I_f) = \sum_{i=1}^{f} l_i$ mod p. Then, we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\prod_{i=1}^{f}(x+\zeta^{g_i}y)^{l_i} \equiv (x+y)^{S_0(I_f)} + (x+y)^{S_0(I_f)-1} \times (\sum_{i=1}^{f} y g_i l_i \lambda) \bmod \pi^2\\
&\prod_{i=1}^{f}(x+\zeta^{-g_i}y)^{l_i} \equiv (x+y)^{S_0(I_f)} + (x+y)^{S_0(I_f)-1} \times (-\sum_{i=1}^{f} y g_i l_i \lambda) \bmod \pi^2\\
&\Rightarrow 2\sum_{i=1}^{f} y g_i l_i \lambda \equiv 0 \bmod \pi^2 \Rightarrow S_1(I_f) \equiv 0 \bmod \pi,\\
&\Rightarrow S_1(I_f) \equiv 0 \bmod p.
\end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma 8.8.

$$\begin{aligned}&\prod_{i=1}^{f}(x+\zeta^{g_i}y)^{l_i}\equiv\prod_{i=1}^{f}(x+\zeta^{-g_i}y)^{l_i}\equiv\\&\prod_{i=1}^{f}(y+\zeta^{g_i}x)^{l_i}\equiv\prod_{i=1}^{f}(y+\zeta^{-g_i}x)^{l_i}\ mod\ \pi^{p+1}.\end{aligned}$$

Proof. From proposition 8.7 p. 84, we have $\sum_{i=1}^{f} g_i l_i \equiv 0 \bmod p$ hence $\zeta^{\sum_{i=1}^{f} g_i l_i} = 1$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\prod_{i=1}^{f}(x+\zeta^{g_i}y)^{l_i}=\zeta^{\sum_{i=1}^{f}g_il_i}\prod_{i=1}^{f}(\zeta^{-g_i}x+y)^{l_i}\\&\prod_{i=1}^{f}(x+\zeta^{-g_i}y)^{l_i}=\zeta^{\sum_{i=1}^{f}(-g_il_i)}\prod_{i=1}^{f}(\zeta^{g_i}x+y)^{l_i}\end{aligned}$$

which leads to the result. □

Lemma 8.9.

$$\sum_{i=1}^{f}\frac{g_il_i\zeta^{g_i}}{(x+\zeta^{g_i}y)}+\sum_{i=1}^{f}\frac{g_il_i\zeta^{-g_i}}{(x+\zeta^{-g_i}y)}\equiv 0\ mod\ \pi^{p-1}.$$

Proof. We compute the value of the derivative in the indeterminate X of $P_L(X)$ and $P_L(X^{-1})$ for $X=\zeta$. We have

$$\begin{aligned}&P'_{L,X=\zeta}(X)=P_L(\zeta)\times y\sum_{i=1}^{f}\frac{g_il_i\zeta^{g_i-1}}{(x+\zeta^{g_i}y)},\\&P'_{L,X=\zeta}(X^{-1})=P_L(\zeta^{-1})\times y\sum_{i=1}^{f}\frac{(-g_il_i)\zeta^{-g_i-1}}{(x+\zeta^{-g_i}y)},\end{aligned}$$

and from relation (71) p. 76

$$\begin{aligned}&P_L(\zeta)\equiv P_L(\zeta^{-1})\text{ mod }\pi^{p+1}\\&P_L(\zeta)\not\equiv 0\text{ mod }\pi.\end{aligned}\tag{79}$$

Then from lemma 8.6 p. 83, we deduce that $P'_{L,X=\zeta}(X) - P'_{L,X=\zeta}(X^{-1}) \equiv 0 \text{ mod } \pi^{p-1}$. Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&P_L(\zeta) \times y \sum_{i=1}^{f} \frac{g_i l_i \zeta^{g_i - 1}}{(x+\zeta^{g_i} y)} \equiv \\
&P_L(\zeta^{-1}) \times y \sum_{i=1}^{f} \frac{(-g_i) l_i \zeta^{-g_i - 1}}{(x+\zeta^{-g_i} y)} \text{ mod } \pi^{p-1}.
\end{aligned}$$

Then, we have, from relation (79) p. 85

$$\begin{aligned}
&P_L(\zeta) \times y \sum_{i=1}^{f} \frac{g_i l_i \zeta^{g_i - 1}}{(x+\zeta^{g_i} y)} \equiv \\
&P_L(\zeta) \times y \sum_{i=1}^{f} \frac{(-g_i) l_i \zeta^{-g_i - 1}}{(x+\zeta^{-g_i} y)} \text{ mod } \pi^{p-1}.
\end{aligned}$$

hence

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{i=1}^{f} \frac{g_i l_i \zeta^{g_i - 1}}{(x+\zeta^{g_i} y)} \equiv \\
&\sum_{i=1}^{f} \frac{(-g_i) l_i \zeta^{-g_i - 1}}{(x+\zeta^{-g_i} y)} \text{ mod } \pi^{p-1}.
\end{aligned}$$

which completes the proof. □

Lemma 8.10.

$$y \sum_{i=1}^{f} \frac{g_i l_i \zeta^{g_i}}{(x+\zeta^{g_i} y)} - x \sum_{i=1}^{f} \frac{g_i l_i \zeta^{g_i}}{(y+\zeta^{g_i} x)} \equiv 0 \ mod \ \pi^{p-1}.$$

Proof. Similar to lemma 8.9 p.85 proof, starting from lemma 8.8 p.85. □

Theorem 8.11. **** With previous notations,*

$$\begin{aligned}
&x \sum_{i=1}^{f} \frac{g_i l_i}{(x+\zeta^{g_i} y)} - y \sum_{i=1}^{f} \frac{g_i l_i}{(y+\zeta^{g_i} x)} \equiv 0 \ mod \ \pi^{p-1} \\
&\sum_{i=1}^{f} \frac{g_i l_i}{(x+\zeta^{g_i} y)} + \sum_{i=1}^{f} \frac{g_i l_i}{(x+\zeta^{-g_i} y)} \equiv 0 \ mod \ \pi^{p-1}
\end{aligned} \tag{80}$$

Proof.

- From lemma 8.10 p.86, we get

  $$\sum_{i=1}^{f}\frac{g_i l_i \zeta^{g_i} y}{(x+\zeta^{g_i}y)}-\sum_{i=1}^{f}\frac{g_i l_i \zeta^{g_i} x}{(y+\zeta^{g_i}x)}\equiv 0 \bmod \pi^{p-1},$$

  which leads to

  $$\sum_{i=1}^{f} g_i l_i (1-\frac{x}{(x+\zeta^{g_i}y)})-\sum_{i=1}^{f} g_i l_i (1-\frac{y}{(y+\zeta^{g_i}x)})\equiv 0 \bmod \pi^{p-1}.$$

  But, from lemma 8.7 p.84, $\sum_{i=1}^{f} g_i l_i \equiv 0 \bmod p$.

- From proposition 8.9 p.85, we have

  $$\sum_{i=1}^{f}\frac{g_i l_i \zeta^{g_i} y}{(x+\zeta^{g_i}y)}+\sum_{i=1}^{f}\frac{g_i l_i \zeta^{-g_i} y}{(x+\zeta^{-g_i}y)}\equiv 0 \bmod \pi^{p-1},$$

  and hence

  $$\sum_{i=1}^{f} g_i l_i (1-\frac{x}{(x+\zeta^{g_i}y)})+\sum_{i=1}^{f} g_i l_i (1-\frac{x}{(x+\zeta^{-g_i}y)})\equiv 0 \bmod \pi^{p-1}.$$

□

8.5 Eichler's theorem

We derive from theorem 8.11 p.86 the proof of Eichler's theorem; see also for a proof, Washington [68] theorem 6.23 p 107.

Theorem 8.12. **** Let e_p^- be the power of p dividing the relative class number h^- of $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$. If first case of FLT fails for p, then $e_p^- \geq [\sqrt{p}]-1$.*

Proof.

- Let $(x+\zeta y)\mathbb{Z}[\zeta]=\mathbf{s}^p$, where $\mathbf{s}$ is an integral ideal of $\mathbb{Z}[\zeta]$. From $f<\frac{p-1}{2}$, we derive that $\frac{\prod_{i=1}^{f}\mathbf{s}^{l_i}}{\prod_{i=1}^{f}\overline{\mathbf{s}}^{l_i}}$ is an ideal whose class belongs to the group $C_p^-=C_p/C_p^+$ of order $p^{e_p^-}$.

- Observe that $e_p^- \geq [\sqrt{p}]-1 \Leftrightarrow e_p^- > \sqrt{p}-2$. Suppose that $e_p^- + 2 < \sqrt{p}$ and search for a contradiction. Let $f = e_p^- + 2$. From relation (80) p.86, we derive with $g_i = i, \quad i = 1, \dots, f$,

$$\prod_{i=1}^{f}(x+\zeta^i y)(x+\zeta^{-i}y) \times (\sum_{i=1}^{f} \frac{il_i}{x+\zeta^i y} + \frac{il_i}{x+\zeta^{-i}y}) \equiv 0 \bmod p.$$

- The higher power term in ζ is

$$l_1 \times y^{f-1} \times x^f \times \zeta^{(1+2+\dots+f-1+f)-1} = l_1 \times y^{f-1} \times x^f \times \zeta^{f(f-1)/2-1}.$$

  In the same way, the smaller power in ζ is

$$l_1 \times y^{f-1} \times x^f \times \zeta^{-((1+2+\dots+f-1+f)-1)} = l_1 \times y^{f-1} \times x^f \times \zeta^{-(f(f-1)/2-1)}.$$

- We have $e_p + 2 < \sqrt{p} \Rightarrow f < \sqrt{p} \Rightarrow f(f-1) < p \Rightarrow f(f-1)-1 < p-1 \Rightarrow \frac{f(f-1)}{2} - 1 < \frac{p-1}{2}$. Therefore there is no term in $\zeta^{(p-1)/2}$.

- Thus we deduce that $l_1 \equiv 0 \bmod p$ and even that $l_1 = 0$ because $0 \leq l_1 \leq p-1$; then the higher power in $\zeta \bmod p$ is

$$2 \times l_2 \times y^{f-1} \times x^f \times \zeta^{(1+2+\dots+f-1+f)-2},$$

  so $l_2 = 0$ and so on, $l_1 = l_2 = \dots = l_f = 0$, which contradicts the fact that, in $L(I_f)$, the l_i are not all simultaneously null. Therefore, if first case of FLT fails for p then $e_p^- \geq [\sqrt{p}]-1$.

□

9 FLT first case : Some congruences on Mirimanoff polynomials

In this section, we generalize Mirimanoff's congruences. The next theorem is the first result towards this direction. We have proved that if x, y, z are solutions of the first case of FLT equation, whe should have

$$\sum_{i=1}^{f} \frac{g_i l_i}{(x+\zeta^{g_i} y)} + \sum_{i=1}^{f} \frac{g_i l_i}{(x+\zeta^{-g_i} y)} \equiv 0 \text{ mod } \pi^{p-1}. \tag{81}$$

The results of relation (80) p.86, used in this article directly for the context of Fermat's equation can in fact be generally proved, in a context **strictly independant** of Fermat's Last Theorem , with the only hypothesis:

$$\begin{aligned} & a, b \in \mathbb{Z}, \quad a \times b \times (a^2 - b^2) \not\equiv 0 \text{ mod } p, \\ & \sum_{i=1}^{f} \frac{g_i l_i}{(a+\zeta^{g_i} b)} + \sum_{i=1}^{f} \frac{g_i l_i}{(a+\zeta^{-g_i} b)} \equiv 0 \text{ mod } \pi^{p-1}. \end{aligned} \tag{82}$$

9.1 The foundation Theorem

Theorem 9.1. **** Let I_f be the sets defined in the relation (74). Let $\phi_{2m+1}(T), \quad m = 1, \dots, \frac{p-3}{2}$, be the odd Mirimanoff polynomials of the indeterminate T. Let $t \in \mathbb{N}, \quad 1 < t \leq p-1, \quad t \equiv -\frac{y}{x}$ mod p. Then, we have for all set I_f*

$$\begin{aligned} & S_1(I_f) \equiv 0 \ \textit{mod}\ p, \\ & S_{2m+1}(I_f) \times \phi_{2m+1}(t) \equiv 0 \ \textit{mod}\ p, \quad m = 1, \dots, \frac{p-3}{2}. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. From lemma 8.7 p.84, we have $S_1(I_f) \equiv 0$ mod p. From proposition 8.11 p.86,

$$\sum_{i=1}^{f} \frac{g_i l_i}{(x+\zeta^{g_i} y)} + \sum_{i=1}^{f} \frac{g_i l_i}{(x+\zeta^{-g_i} y)} \equiv 0 \text{ mod } \pi^{p-1}.$$

We have the algebraic identities

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{(x^p+y^p)}{(x+\zeta^{g_i} y)} &= (x^{p-1} - \zeta^{g_i} x^{p-2} y + \zeta^{2g_i} x^{p-3} y^2 - \dots - \zeta^{(p-2)g_i} x y^{p-2} + \zeta^{(p-1)g_i} y^{p-1}), \\ \frac{(x^p+y^p)}{(x+\zeta^{-g_i} y)} &= (x^{p-1} - \zeta^{-g_i} x^{p-2} y + \zeta^{-2g_i} x^{p-3} y^2 - \dots - \zeta^{-(p-2)g_i} x y^{p-2} + \zeta^{-(p-1)g_i} y^{p-1}). \end{aligned}$$

We deduce of these relations that

(83)

$$F(\zeta) =$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^{f} g_i l_i (x^{p-1} - \zeta^{g_i} x^{p-2} y + \zeta^{2g_i} x^{p-3} y^2 - \dots - \zeta^{(p-2)g_i} x y^{p-2} + \zeta^{(p-1)g_i} y^{p-1})$$

$$+ \sum_{i=1}^{f} g_i l_i (x^{p-1} - \zeta^{-g_i} x^{p-2} y + \zeta^{-2g_i} x^{p-3} y^2 - \dots - \zeta^{-(p-2)g_i} x y^{p-2} + \zeta^{-(p-1)g_i} y^{p-1})$$

$$\equiv 0 \mod \pi^{p-1}.$$

From relation (83) p. 90, we can write $F(\zeta) = \frac{f(\zeta)}{\zeta^u}$ whith $f(X) \in \mathbb{Z}[X]$ and $u \in \mathbb{N}$. Then, let $F(X) \in \mathbb{Q}(X)$ be the rational function of the indeterminate X where ζ is replaced by X in the previous value of $F(\zeta)$, thus $F(X) = \frac{f(X)}{X^u}$. Here, let us denote $b'_X(X)$ the derivative of any function $b(X)$ for X. We define the functions $F_1(X), F_2(X), F_3(X), \dots$ by

$$\begin{aligned} & F_1(X) = X \times F'_X(X), \\ & F_2(X) = X \times (F_1)'_X(X), \\ & F_3(X) = X \times (F_2)'_X(X), \\ & \vdots \end{aligned} \tag{84}$$

From proposition 8.4 p.82 we have :

$$\begin{aligned} & F(\zeta) \equiv 0 \mod \pi^{p-1}, \\ & F_1(\zeta) \equiv 0 \mod \pi^{p-2}, \\ & F_2(\zeta) \equiv 0 \mod \pi^{p-3}, \\ & F_3(\zeta) \equiv 0 \mod \pi^{p-4}, \\ & \vdots \\ & F_{p-3}(\zeta) \equiv 0 \mod \pi^{2}. \end{aligned} \tag{85}$$

Then, we obtain

(86)

$$F_1(\zeta) =$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^{f} (g_i)^2 l_i (-\zeta^{g_i} x^{p-2} y + 2\zeta^{2g_i} x^{p-3} y^2 - \dots - (p-2)\zeta^{(p-2)g_i} x y^{p-2} + (p-1)\zeta^{(p-1)g_i} y^{p-1})$$

$$- \sum_{i=1}^{f} (g_i)^2 l_i (-\zeta^{-g_i} x^{p-2} y + 2\zeta^{-2g_i} x^{p-3} y^2 - \dots - (p-2)\zeta^{-(p-2)g_i} x y^{p-2} + (p-1)\zeta^{-(p-1)g_i} y^{p-1}),$$

thus, substituting 1 to ζ, we get $F_1(1) = 0$. In the same way for $F_2(\zeta)$ we obtain,

(87)

$$F_2(\zeta) =$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^{f}(g_i)^3 l_i(-\zeta^{g_i}x^{p-2}y + 2^2\zeta^{2g_i}x^{p-3}y^2 - \cdots - (p-2)^2\zeta^{(p-2)g_i}xy^{p-2} + (p-1)^2\zeta^{(p-1)g_i}y^{p-1})$$

$$+\sum_{i=1}^{f}(g_i)^3 l_i(-\zeta^{-g_i}x^{p-2}y + 2^2\zeta^{-2g_i}x^{p-3}y^2 - \cdots - (p-2)^2\zeta^{-(p-2)g_i}xy^{p-2} + (p-1)^2\zeta^{-(p-1)g_i}y^{p-1}),$$

so, by substitution of 1 to ζ,

$$2 \times (\sum_{i=1}^{f}(g_i)^3 l_i(-x^{p-2}y + 2^2x^{p-3}y^2 - \cdots - (p-2)^2xy^{p-2} + (p-1)^2y^{p-1})) \equiv 0 \bmod \pi,$$

also

$$2 \times (\sum_{i=1}^{f} g_i^3 l_i(-\frac{y}{x} + 2^2\frac{y^2}{x^2} - \cdots - (p-2)^2\frac{y^{p-2}}{x^{p-2}} + (p-1)^2\frac{y^{p-1}}{x^{p-1}})) \equiv 0 \bmod p,$$

also

$$2 \times (\sum_{i=1}^{f} g_i^3 l_i) \times ((-\frac{y}{x} + 2^2\frac{y^2}{x^2} - \cdots - (p-2)^2\frac{y^{p-2}}{x^{p-2}} + (p-1)^2\frac{y^{p-1}}{x^{p-1}})) \equiv 0 \bmod p,$$

hence $F_2(1) = 2 \times S_3(I_f) \times \Phi_3(t) \equiv 0 \bmod p$. In the same way

$$\begin{aligned}
&F_3(1) = 0,\\
&F_4(1) = 2 \times S_5(I_f)\Phi_5(t) \equiv 0 \bmod p,\\
&F_5(1) = 0,\\
&\vdots\\
&F_{2m}(1) = 2 \times S_{2m+1}(I_f)\Phi_{2m+1}(t) \equiv 0 \bmod p,\\
&\vdots\\
&F_{p-3}(1) = 2 \times S_{p-2}(I_f)\Phi_{p-2}(t) \equiv 0 \bmod p,\\
&F_{p-2}(1) = 0.
\end{aligned} \tag{88}$$

which achieves the proof. □

A definition : We define the polynomials $\phi^*_{2m+1}(T)$ by

$$(89)\qquad \begin{aligned} &\phi^*_1(T) = 1,\\ &\phi^*_{2m+1}(T) = \phi_{2m+1}(T), \quad m = 1, \dots, \frac{p-3}{2}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that, with this definition, the previous theorem can be stated

$$\phi^*_{2m+1}(t) \times S_{2m+1}(I_f) \equiv 0 \text{ mod } p, \quad m = 0, \dots, \frac{p-3}{2}.$$

The interest of this definition will appear more clearly in the sequel of this section. The next lemma plays an important part in the sequel of this article.

Lemma 9.2. *Let $S_{2m+1}(I_f)$, $\quad m = 0, \dots, \frac{p-3}{2}$, be the sums defined in the relation (76) p.81. Then, if $S_1(I_f) \equiv 0$ mod p and $S_{2m+1}(I_f) \times \Phi_{2m+1}(t) \equiv 0$ mod p for $m = 1, \dots, \frac{p-3}{2}$ then (reciprocal result of theorem 9.1 p.89) :*

$$\sum_{i=1}^{f} \frac{g_i l_i}{(x + \zeta^{g_i} y)} + \sum_{i=1}^{f} \frac{g_i l_i}{(x + \zeta^{-g_i} y)} \equiv 0 \textit{ mod } p.$$

Proof. Let us define $F(X) \in \mathbb{Q}(X)$ by:

(90)

$F(X) =$

$$\sum_{i=1}^{f} g_i l_i \times (x^{p-1} - X^{g_i} x^{p-2} y + X^{2g_i} x^{p-3} y^2 - \dots - X^{(p-2)g_i} x y^{p-2} + X^{(p-1)g_i} y^{p-1})$$

$$+ \sum_{i=1}^{f} g_i l_i \times (x^{p-1} - X^{-g_i} x^{p-2} y + X^{-2g_i} x^{p-3} y^2 - \dots - X^{-(p-2)g_i} x y^{p-2} + X^{-(p-1)g_i} y^{p-1}).$$

We have

$$F(\zeta) = (x^p + y^p) \times (\sum_{i=1}^{f} \frac{g_i l_i}{(x + \zeta^{g_i} y)} + \sum_{i=1}^{f} \frac{g_i l_i}{(x + \zeta^{-g_i} y)})$$

It is enough to prove that $F(\zeta) \equiv 0$ mod p. The function $F(X)$ is of the form $F(X) = \frac{a(X)}{X^u}$ where $a(X) \in \mathbb{Z}[X]$ and $u \in \mathbb{N}$. With π-adic developpment, we have

$$\begin{aligned} F(\zeta) = F(1) + (\zeta - 1) F'_X(1) + \frac{(\zeta - 1)^2}{2!} F^{(2)}_X(1) + \dots \\ + \frac{(\zeta - 1)^{p-2}}{(p-2)!} F^{(p-2)}_X(1) + \sum_{i=p-1}^{+\infty} \frac{(\zeta - 1)^i}{i!} F_X(1), \end{aligned}$$

where we verify directly that, for $i \geq p-1$, we obtain $\frac{(\zeta-1)^i}{i!} F^{(i)X(1)} \equiv 0 \text{ mod } \pi^i, \quad i \geq p-1$:

1. For $i = p-1$, it is clear.
2. For $i > p-1$:
    - If $j \geq i$: let the term $c_j X^j$ of $F(X)$, $\quad c_j \in \mathbb{Z}$. We get $\frac{(X^j)^{(i)}_X}{i!} = \frac{j(j-1)\ldots(j-i+1)}{i!} X^{j-i} = C^i_j \times X^{j-i}$. Thus, we get $C^i_j \equiv 0 \bmod p^\alpha, \quad \alpha \geq 0$.
    - If $i > j \geq 0$ then $(X^j)^{(i)}_X = 0$.
    - If $j < 0$ then let $j_1 = -j$. We get
    $$\frac{(X^j)^{(i)}_X}{i!} = \pm \frac{j_1(j_1+1)\ldots(j_1+i-1)}{i!} = \pm C^i_{j_1+i-1} \in \mathbb{Z}.$$
    We obtain also $C^i_{j_1+i-1} \equiv 0 \bmod p^\alpha, \quad \alpha \geq 0$.

    which leads to the result.

So we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} F(\zeta) &\equiv F(1) + (\zeta-1)F^{(1)}_X(1) + \frac{(\zeta-1)^2}{2!}F^{(2)}_X(1) + \ldots \\ &+ \frac{(\zeta-1)^{p-2}}{(p-2)!}F^{(p-2)}_X(1) \bmod \pi^{p-1}. \end{aligned} \tag{91}$$

We have $F(1) \equiv 0 \bmod p$. Let us denote, with $F'_X(X)$ the derivative of $F(X)$ for X,

$$\begin{aligned} &F_1(X) = X \times F'_X(X), \\ &F_2(X) = X \times (F_1)'_X(X), \\ &F_3(X) = X \times (F_2)'_X(X), \\ &\vdots \end{aligned}$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned} &F_2(X) = X^2 F^{(2)}_X(X) + X F'_X(X) \\ &F_3(X) = X^3 F^{(3)}_X(X) + 3X^2 F^{(2)}_X(X) + X F'_X(X) \\ &\vdots \end{aligned}$$

Then,

$$\begin{aligned} &F'_X(1) = F_1(1), \\ &F^{(2)}_X(1) = F_2(1) - F_1(1), \\ &F^{(3)}_X(1) = F_3(1) - 3F_2(1) + 2F_1(1), \\ &\vdots \end{aligned} \tag{92}$$

The same computation as in relations (83) p.90, (86) p.90, (87) p.91 and (88) p. 91 of proposition 9.1 p. 89, leads by derivation of $F(X)$, to

$$
(93)\quad
\begin{aligned}
&F(1) \equiv 2 \times S_1(I_f) \times \phi_1(t) + 2\sum_{i=1}^{f} g_i l_i = 2 \times S_1(I_f) \times (\phi_1(t)+1) \equiv 0 \bmod p,\\
&F_1(1) = 0,\\
&F_2(1) \equiv 2 \times S_3(I_f) \times \phi_3(t) \equiv 0 \bmod p,\\
&F_3(1) = 0,\\
&F_4(1) \equiv 2 \times S_5(I_f) \times \phi_5(t) \equiv 0 \bmod p,\\
&\vdots\\
&F_{p-3}(1) \equiv 2 \times S_{p-2}(I_f) \times \Phi_{p-2}(t) \equiv 0 \bmod p\\
&F_{p-2}(1) = 0.
\end{aligned}
$$

From hypothesis, relations (92) p.93 and (93) p.94, we have $F(1) \equiv F'_X(1) \equiv F_X^{(2)}(1) \equiv \cdots \equiv F_X^{(p-2)}(1) \equiv 0 \bmod p$ and then $F(\zeta) \equiv 0 \bmod p$. □

9.2 Definitions connected with sets I_f

The definitions of this subsection are important for the sequel of this note. Let $h = p^{e_p} \times h_2, \quad h_2 \not\equiv 0 \bmod p$, be the class number of $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$. Let $f = min(e_p + 2, \frac{p-1}{2})$. Consider the set $I_f = \{g_i \quad | \quad i = 1, \dots, f\}$ defined in theorem 8.2 p.79. There exists a **minimum rank** $r(I_f) \in \mathbb{N}, \quad r(I_f) \leq f$, or more shortly r for $r(I_f)$ if context allows it, which verifies simultaneously the relations :

$$
(94)\quad
\begin{aligned}
&r(I_f) \leq f = \min\,(e_p + 2, \frac{p-1}{2}),\\
&J_r = \{g_i \quad | \quad i = 1, \dots, r\}, \quad J_r \subset I_f = \{g_i \quad | \quad i = 1, \dots, f\},\\
&J'_r = \{p - g_i \quad | \quad i = 1, \dots, r\} \neq J_r,\\
&N(J_r) = \{n_1, \dots, n_r\}, \quad n_1, \dots, n_r \text{ not all } 0, \quad n_r = 1,\\
&\sum_{i=1}^{r} \frac{g_i n_i}{(x + \zeta^{g_i} y)} + \sum_{i=1}^{r} \frac{g_i n_i}{(x + \zeta^{-g_i} y)} \equiv 0 \bmod p,
\end{aligned}
$$

these relations being impossible for any strict subset $J_{r'} \subset J_r, \quad r' < r$. Observe that

- We have $r(I_f) > 1$ because $\frac{g_1 n_1}{(x+\zeta^{g_1} y)} + \frac{g_1 n_1}{(x+\zeta^{-g_1} y)} \not\equiv 0 \bmod p$.
- For this value of $r = r(I_f)$, recall the notation

$$S_{2m+1}(J_r) \equiv \sum_{i=1}^{r} g_i^{2m+1} n_i \bmod p.$$

9.3 Definitions connected with sets U_f.

Let u be a primitive root $\mod p$; recall that, for $0 \le i \le p-1$, we note indifferently

$$u_i \equiv u^i \mod p, \quad 1 \le u_i \le p-1.$$

Lemma 9.3. *Let $u \in \mathbb{N}$, $\quad 1 < u < p-1$, be a primitive root $\mod p$. Then,*

$$\begin{aligned} &U_f = \{u, u_2, \dots, u_f\} \neq \\ &U'_f = \{p-u, p-u_2, \dots p-u_f\}. \end{aligned}$$

and the set U_f verifies the conditions of definition of I_f sets in subsection 9.2 p. 94.

Proof. We shall prove that the set U_f verifies the hypothesis assumed for sets I_f: u is a primitive root $\mod p$, so we have $u^{(p-1)/2} + 1 \equiv 0 \mod p$. Let $d \in \mathbb{N}$ with $d \quad | \quad \frac{(p-1)}{2}, \quad d \neq \frac{(p-1)}{2}$. We have $u^d \not\equiv \pm 1 \mod p :$ if not, we would have $u^{2d} \equiv 1 \mod p$, which would contradict the fact that u is a primitive root $\mod p$.

- For $1 \le k < k' \le f$, we have $u_k \not\equiv u_{k'} \mod p :$ if not, we should have $u^{k-k'} \equiv 1 \mod p, \quad 1 < k'-k < p-1$, a contradiction.
- Show that $U_f \neq U'_f$: Suppose that $U_f = U'_f$ and search for a contradiction: for all k, there should exist k' such that $u_k \equiv p - u_{k'} \mod p$, so $u^{k'-k} \equiv -1 \mod p$, so $k'-k \equiv 0 \mod \frac{p-1}{2}$, hence $k' = k + \frac{p-1}{2}$, that contradicts $1 \le k < k' \le f \le \frac{p-1}{2}$.

Therefore, the set $U_f = \{u, u_2, \dots, u_{f-1}\}$ verifies the relations assumed for the sets I_f. □

This definition of U_f set is important for the sequel of this note. We have shown that the definition for the set I_f given in relation(94) p.94 can be applied, *mutatis mutandis*, to the set U_f:

There exists a minimum **rank** $r \in \mathbb{N}, \quad r \le f, \quad$ with

$$\begin{aligned} &r \le f = \min\ (e_p + 2, \frac{p-1}{2}) \\ &u \in \mathbb{N}, \quad \text{primitive root } \mod p \\ &J_r = \{u_i \quad | \quad i = 1, \dots, r\}, \\ &J'_r = \{p - u_i \quad | \quad i = 1, \dots, r\} \neq J_r \\ &N_r = \{n_1, \dots, n_r\}, \quad n_1 \not\equiv 0 \mod p, \quad n_r = 1 \\ &\sum_{i=1}^{r} \frac{u_i n_i}{(x + \zeta^{u_i} y)} + \sum_{i=1}^{r} \frac{u_i n_i}{(x + \zeta^{-u_i} y)} \equiv 0 \mod p, \end{aligned} \tag{95}$$

these relations being impossible for any $r' < r$. For this value r, let us denote $S_{2m+1}(J_r)$ or more brievely $S_{2m+1}(r)$ defined by

$$S_{2m+1}(J_r) \equiv \sum_{i=1}^{r} u_{i(2m+1)} n_i \bmod p.$$

The value r is called the p-rank of FLT congruences $\bmod p$. **Remarks :**

- We can always suppose that $n_1 \not\equiv 0 \bmod p$ and that $n_r = 1$, if not r would not be the minimal rank.
- It is clear that set U_r is a I_f set.
- These definitions play a **crucial part** in the sequel of this chapter.
- Observe that the two next congruences are equivalent, we shall use indifferently one or other form, corresponding to a conjugation σ which does not affect congruences $\bmod \pi^{p-1}$:

$$\sum_{i=1}^{r} \frac{u_i n_i}{(x+\zeta^{u_i} y)} + \sum_{i=1}^{r} \frac{u_i n_i}{(x+\zeta^{-u_i} y)} \equiv 0,$$
$$\sum_{i=1}^{r} \frac{u_{i-1} n_i}{(x+\zeta^{u_{i-1}} y)} + \sum_{i=1}^{r} \frac{u_{i-1} n_i}{(x+\zeta^{-u_{i-1}} y)} \equiv 0.$$

9.4 Connection between sum and product congruences mod π^{p-1} of sets U_f

The next results connect product congruences and sum congruences of minimal rank. We shall show in the two next lemmas, that $f = r$ is the smallest value such that there exists simultaneously $n_1, \dots, n_f$ not all zero with

$$\sum_{i=1}^{f} \frac{u_i n_i}{(x+\zeta^{u_i} y)} + \sum_{i=1}^{f} \frac{u_i n_i}{(x+\zeta^{u_i} y)} \equiv 0 \bmod \pi^{p-1},$$
$$\prod_{i=1}^{f} (x+\zeta^{u_i} y)^{n_i} - \prod_{i=1}^{f} (x+\zeta^{-u_i} y)^{n_i} \equiv 0 \bmod \pi^{p-1}.$$

The next lemma is a purely technical result.

Lemma 9.4. *For every set U_f, the congruence*

$$\sum_{i=1}^{f} \frac{u_i n_i}{(x+\zeta^{u_i} y)} + \sum_{i=1}^{f} \frac{u_i n_i}{(x+\zeta^{-u_i} y)} \equiv 0 \ mod\ p$$

implies the congruence

$$\sum_{i=1}^{f}\frac{u_i n_i\zeta^{u_i}}{(x+\zeta^{u_i}y)}+\sum_{i=1}^{f}\frac{u_i n_i\zeta^{-u_i}}{(x+\zeta^{-u_i}y)}\equiv 0 \ mod\ p.$$

Proof. Note at first that, from hypothesis, we get $\sum_{i=1}^{f} u_i n_i \equiv 0 \mod \pi$, hence $\sum_{i=1}^{f} u_i n_i \equiv 0 \mod p$.

$$\sum_{i=1}^{f}\frac{u_i n_i}{(x+\zeta^{u_i}y)}+\sum_{i=1}^{f}\frac{u_i n_i}{(x+\zeta^{-u_i}y)}\equiv 0 \mod p$$

leads to

$$\sum_{i=1}^{f}\frac{u_i n_i x}{(x+\zeta^{u_i}y)}+\sum_{i=1}^{f}\frac{u_i n_i x}{(x+\zeta^{-u_i}y)}\equiv 0 \mod p$$
$$2\sum_{i=1}^{f}u_i n_i-(\sum_{i=1}^{f}\frac{y u_i n_i\zeta^{u_i}}{(x+\zeta^{u_i}y)}+\sum_{i=1}^{f}\frac{y u_i n_i\zeta^{-u_i}}{(x+\zeta^{-u_i}y)})\equiv 0 \mod p,$$

which achieves the proof. □

The relation (95) p.95 gives a minimal r for the congruences with the sums $\sum_{i=1}^{r}\frac{u_i n_i}{(x+\zeta^{u_i}y)}$. The next lemma shows that this minimal r is also for the product congruences with $\prod_{i=1}^{r}(x+\zeta^{u_i}y)$.

Lemma 9.5. *Let r and $n_1,\dots,n_r \in \mathbb{N}$ defined in the relation (95) p.95 of section (9.3) p.95. Then*
$\prod_{i=1}^{r}(x+\zeta^{u_i}y)^{n_i}-\prod_{i=1}^{r}(x+\zeta^{-u_i}y)^{n_i}\equiv 0$ *mod p. Moreover, there does not exist $t<r$ and $l_1,\dots,l_t \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\prod_{i=1}^{t}(x+\zeta^{u_i}y)^{l_i}-\prod_{i=1}^{t}(x+\zeta^{u_i}y)^{l_i}\equiv 0$ mod p.*

Proof.

- From relation (95) p.95, we have $\sum_{i=1}^{r}\frac{u_i n_i}{(x+\zeta^{u_i}y)}+\sum_{i=1}^{r}\frac{u_i n_i}{(x+\zeta^{-u_i}y)}\equiv 0 \mod \pi^{p-1}$. Note that $\prod_{i=1}^{r}(x+\zeta^{u_i}y)^{n_i}-\prod_{i=1}^{r}(x+\zeta^{-u_i}y)^{n_i}\equiv 0 \mod \pi$.

  Suppose that for $\nu \in \mathbb{N}$, $1\leq \nu \leq p-2$, we have $\pi^{\nu} \parallel (\prod_{i=1}^{r}(x+\zeta^{u_i}y)^{n_i}-\prod_{i=1}^{r}(x+\zeta^{-u_i}y)^{n_i})$ and search for a contradiction. Then, by derivation, (with the substitution, from lemma 8.4 p.82, of ζ by the indeterminate X, we should deduce that

  $$\pi^{\nu-1} \parallel (\prod_{i=1}^{r}(x+\zeta^{u_i}y)^{n_i}\times\sum_{i=1}^{r}\frac{u_i n_i\zeta^{u_i}}{(x+\zeta^{u_i}y)}-\prod_{i=1}^{r}(x+\zeta^{-u_i}y)^{n_i}\times\sum_{i=1}^{r}\frac{-u_i n_i\zeta^{-u_i}}{(x+\zeta^{-u_i}y)}),$$

which contradicts the two simultaneous relations

$$\pi^{\nu}\|(\prod_{i=1}^{r}(x+\zeta^{u_i}y)^{n_i}-\prod_{i=1}^{r}(x+\zeta^{-u_i}y)^{n_i})$$
$$\sum_{i=1}^{r}\frac{u_i n_i \zeta^{u_i}}{(x+\zeta^{u_i}y)}-\sum_{i=1}^{r}\frac{-u_i n_i \zeta^{-u_i}}{(x+\zeta^{-u_i}y)}\equiv 0 \text{ mod } \pi^{p-1},$$

the second one obtained from lemma 9.4 p.96. Therefore, we have $\nu \geq p-1$.

- Suppose that for $t < r$, there would exist $l_1, \dots, l_t$ with $\prod_{i=1}^{t}(x+\zeta^{u_i}y)^{l_i} - \prod_{i=1}^{t}(x+\zeta^{-u_i}y)^{l_i} \equiv 0 \bmod p$. Then, we would get $\sum_{i=1}^{t}\frac{u_i l_i}{(x+\zeta^{u_i}y)}+\sum_{i=1}^{t}\frac{u_i l_i}{(x+\zeta^{-u_i}y)} \equiv 0 \text{ mod } p$, which would contradict the minimality of r.

□

To summarize, at the end of this section,we thus assert that, for the minimal r of relation (95) p.95, simultaneously:

$$\text{There exists} \quad n_1, \dots, n_r$$
$$\sum_{i=1}^{r}\frac{u_i n_i}{(x+\zeta^{u_i}y)}+\sum_{i=1}^{r}\frac{u_i n_i}{(x+\zeta^{-u_i}y)}\equiv 0 \text{ mod } \pi^{p-1}$$
$$\prod_{i=1}^{r}(x+\zeta^{u^i}y)^{n_i}-\prod_{i=1}^{r}(x+\zeta^{-u^i}y)^{n_i}\equiv 0 \text{ mod } \pi^{p-1}.$$

9.5 A canonical form of congruences mod p for FLT first case-I

The Mirimanoff congruences assert that

$\phi_{2m+1}(t) \times B_{p-1-2m} \equiv 0 \text{ mod } p, \quad m = 1, \dots \frac{p-3}{2}$, where B_{p-1-2m} are even Bernoulli numbers. But they do not give any information on the possibility to simultaneously have $\phi_{2m+1}(t) \equiv 0 \text{ mod } p$ and $B_{p-1-2m} \equiv 0 \text{ mod } p$. In the congruences $\phi_{2m+1}(t) \times S_{2m+1}(J_r) \equiv 0 \text{ mod } p, \quad m = 1, \dots, \frac{p-3}{2}$, that we obtain, we shall show that **else** $\phi_{2m+1}(t) \equiv 0 \text{ mod } p$, **else** $S_{2m+1}(J_r) \equiv 0 \text{ mod } p$.

Recall that, for the indeterminate T, we define $\phi^*_{2m+1}(T)$ by $\phi^*_1(T) = 1$ for $m = 0$ and $\phi^*_{2m+1}(T) = \phi_{2m+1}(T)$ for $m = 1, \dots, \frac{p-3}{2}$.

Theorem 9.6. **** Let $t \equiv -\frac{y}{x}$ mod p. Let r defined in the relation (95) p.95. If the First Case of Fermat's Last Theorem fails for p, then there exist exactly $\frac{(p-1)}{2} - r + 1$ different values $m, \quad m \in \mathbb{N}, \quad 1 \leq m \leq \frac{p-3}{2}$, such that we have the Mirimanoff polynomial congruences:*

$$\phi_{2m+1}(t) \equiv 0 \textit{ mod } p.$$

Moreover, r does not depend on the primitive root u mod p taken to define U_f.

Proof. We have $J_r = \{u, u_2, \dots, u_r\}$ where u is a primitive root mod p.

- Show at first that there are at least $\frac{p-1}{2} - r + 1$ different values m, $0 \leq m \leq \frac{p-3}{2}$, such that $\phi^*_{2m+1}(t) \equiv 0 \bmod p$, where the notation $\phi^*_{2m+1}(T)$ has been previously defined. Suppose that this assertion is false and search for a contradiction : then there exists at most $\frac{p-1}{2} - r$ different values such that $\phi^*_{2m+1}(t) \equiv 0 \bmod p$, $0 \leq m \leq \frac{p-3}{2}$. Then there exists at least r values $m_1 = 0, m_2 \neq 0, \dots, m_r \neq 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\phi^*_{2m_1+1}(t) = 1 \not\equiv 0 \bmod p,\\
&\phi^*_{2m_2+1}(t) \not\equiv 0 \bmod p,\\
&\vdots\\
&\phi^*_{2m_r+1}(t) \not\equiv 0 \bmod p.
\end{aligned}$$

From theorem 9.1 p.89 and definitions (95) p.95, *mutatis mutandis*,

$$\begin{aligned}
&f \rightarrow r,\\
&I_f \rightarrow J_r,\\
&L(I_f) \rightarrow N(J_r),
\end{aligned}$$

then we get

$$\begin{aligned}
&S_{2m_1+1}(J_r) \equiv 0 \bmod p,\\
&S_{2m_2+1}(J_r) \equiv 0 \bmod p,\\
&\vdots\\
&S_{2m_r+1}(J_r) \equiv 0 \bmod p,
\end{aligned}$$

hence

$$\begin{aligned}
&n_1 + n_2 u^{2m_1+1} + \dots + n_r u^{(r-1)(2m_1+1)} \equiv 0 \bmod p,\\
&n_1 + n_2 u^{2m_2+1} + \dots + n_r u^{(r-1)(2m_2+1)} \equiv 0 \bmod p,\\
&\vdots\\
&n_1 + n_2 u^{2m_r+1} + \dots + n_r u^{(r-1)(2m_r+1)} \equiv 0 \bmod p.
\end{aligned}$$

The determinant of this system of r congruences in the r indeterminates $n_1, n_2, \dots, n_r$,

$$\begin{vmatrix} 1 & u^{2m_1+1} & \dots & u^{(r-1)(2m_1+1)} \\ 1 & u^{2m_2+1} & \dots & u^{(r-1)(2m_2+1)} \\ \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots \\ 1 & u^{2m_r+1} & \dots & u^{(r-1)(2m_r+1)} \end{vmatrix} \tag{96}$$

is a Vandermonde determinant with factors $(u^{2m_k+1} - u^{2m_l+1}) \not\equiv 0 \bmod p$ because u is a primitive root $\bmod p$. Therefore $n_1 = n_2 = \cdots = n_r = 0$, which contradicts hypothesis on $N(J_r)$.

- Show secondly that there are at most $\frac{p-1}{2} - r + 1$ different values such that $\phi^*_{2m+1}(t) \equiv 0 \bmod p, \quad 0 \leq m \leq \frac{p-3}{2}$: Suppose that this assertion is false and search for a contradiction : Then there exist at least $\frac{p-1}{2} - r + 2$ different values $m, \quad 0 \leq m \leq \frac{p-3}{2}$, such that $\phi^*_{2m+1}(t) \equiv 0 \bmod p$. Then there exists at most $\nu \leq r-2$ values $m_1 = 0, m_2 \neq 0, \ldots, m_\nu \neq 0$, such that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\phi^*_{2m_1+1}(t) = 1 \not\equiv 0 \bmod p\\
&\vdots\\
&\phi^*_{2m_\nu+1}(t) \not\equiv 0 \bmod p.
\end{aligned}$$

It is possible to find $l_1, l_2, \ldots, l_\nu, l_{\nu+1} = 1 \in \mathbb{N}$, not all zero such that

$$\begin{aligned}
&l_1 + l_2 u^{2m_1+1} + \cdots + l_\nu u^{(\nu-1)(2m_1+1)} + l_{\nu+1} u^{\nu(2m_1+1)} \equiv 0 \bmod p,\\
&l_1 + l_2 u^{2m_2+1} + \cdots + l_\nu u^{(\nu-1)(2m_2+1)} + l_{\nu+1} u^{\nu(2m_2+1)} \equiv 0 \bmod p,\\
&\vdots\\
&l_1 + l_2 u^{2m_\nu+1} + \cdots + l_\nu u^{(\nu-1)(2m_\nu+1} + l_{\nu+1} u^{\nu(2m_\nu+1)} \equiv 0 \bmod p.
\end{aligned}$$

because the determinant

$$\begin{vmatrix}
1 & u^{2m_1+1} & \ldots & u^{(\nu-1)(2m_1+1)}\\
1 & u^{2m_2+1} & \ldots & u^{(\nu-1)(2m_2+1)}\\
\vdots & \vdots & & \vdots\\
1 & u^{2m_\nu+1} & \ldots & u^{(\nu-1)(2m_\nu+1)}
\end{vmatrix} \tag{97}$$

is a Vandermonde determinant with factors $(u^{2m_k+1} - u^{2m_l+1}) \not\equiv 0 \bmod p$, because u is a primitive root $\bmod p$. Therefore we have,

$$\begin{aligned}
&J_{\nu+1} = \{u, u^2, \ldots, u^{\nu+1}\}\\
&L(J_{\nu+1}) = \{l_1, l_2, \ldots, l_{\nu+1}\}\\
&S_{2m_1+1}(J_{\nu+1}) \equiv 0 \bmod p\\
&S_{2m_2+1}(J_{\nu+1}) \equiv 0 \bmod p\\
&\vdots\\
&S_{2m_\nu+1}(J_{\nu+1}) \equiv 0 \bmod p
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, for $m \in M = \{m_1 = 0, m_2, \dots, m_\nu\}$, we have $S_{2m+1}(J_{\nu+1}) \equiv 0 \bmod p$ and for $m \in \{0, 1, \dots, \frac{p-3}{2}\} - M$, we have $\phi^*_{2m+1}(t) \equiv 0 \bmod p$ and hence

$$S_{2m+1}(J_{\nu+1}) \times \phi^*_{2m+1}(t) \equiv 0 \bmod p, \quad m = 0, 1, \dots, \frac{p-3}{2}.$$

From lemma 9.2 p.92, this leads to the relation

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\nu+1} \frac{u_i n_i}{(x + \zeta^{u_i} y)} + \sum_{i=1}^{\nu+1} \frac{u_i n_i}{(x + \zeta^{-u_i} y)} \equiv 0 \bmod p,$$

which contradicts the minimal value of $r = r(U_f) > \nu + 1$.

- From first part of the proof, r depends only of the number of Mirimanoff polynomials $\phi_{2m+1}(T), \quad 0 \le m \le \frac{p-3}{2}$, with $\phi_{2m+1}(t) \equiv 0 \bmod p$ and does not depend on the primitive root $u \bmod p$ taken to define U_f.

- From $\phi^*_1(t) = 1$ and $\phi^*_{2m+1}(t) = \phi_{2m+1}(t)$ for $m = 1, \dots, \frac{p-3}{2}$, we deduce that the number of $m, \quad 1 \le m \le \frac{p-3}{2}$ with $\phi_{2m+1}(t) \equiv 0 \bmod p$ is the number of $m, \quad 0 \le m \le \frac{p-3}{2}$ with $\phi^*_{2m+1}(t) \equiv 0 \bmod p$, which completes the proof.

□

Corollary 9.7. **** Let $h = p^{e_p} \times h_2, \quad h_2 \not\equiv 0 \bmod p$, be the class number of $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$. Suppose that first case of FLT fails for p. Let $t, \quad t \in \mathbb{N}, \quad t \equiv -\frac{x}{y} \bmod p$. If $e_p < \frac{p-1}{2}$, then there are at least $\frac{p-3}{2} - e_p$ Mirimanoff polynomials of odd indice $\phi_{2m+1}(T), \quad 1 \le m \le \frac{p-3}{2}$, with*

$$\phi_{2m+1}(t) \equiv 0 \bmod p.$$

Proof. From relation (94) p.94, we have $r \le e_p + 2$. The result is then an immediate consequence of theorem 9.6 p.98, where the number of $\phi_{2m+1}(t) \equiv 0$ is $\frac{p-1}{2} - r + 1$. □

9.6 A comparison with Mirimanoff, Herbrand and Ribet/Kolyvagin

- Recall and fix some notations:
  - Recall that the class number h of $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$ is $h = p^{e_p} \times h_2, \quad h_2 \not\equiv 0 \bmod p$.

  - Let r_p be the p-rank of the class group of $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$. Let r_p^+ be the p-rank of the class group of $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta+\zeta^{-1})$. Let $r_p^- = r_p - r_p^+$ be the relative p-rank.
  - Let, as previously, $t \equiv -\frac{x}{y} \bmod p$.
  - Let $G = Gal(\mathbb{Q}(\zeta_p)/\mathbb{Q}) \simeq (\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z})^*$.
  - Let A be the $p-$Sylow subgroup of the ideal class group of $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$. So A is a $\mathbb{Z}_p[G]$-module for G acting on A. Let $A = \oplus_{i=0}^{p-2} A_i$ be the decomposition of A as $\mathbb{Z}_p[G]-$module. (see for instance [68]) 6.3 p 100).
  - Let $E_A = \{A_{2m+1} \quad | \quad 1 \le m \le \frac{p-3}{2}, \quad A_{2m+1} \ne 0\}$.
  - Let $i_A = Card(E_A)$.
  - Let $B_{p-2m-1}, \quad 1 \le m \le \frac{p-3}{2}$, be even Bernoulli numbers.
  - Let $E_B = \{B_{p-2m-1} \quad | \quad 1 \le m \le \frac{p-3}{2}, \quad B_{p-2m-1} \equiv 0 \bmod p\}$.
  - We note $i_p = Card(E_B)$ the index of irregularity of p.
  - Let $\phi_{2m+1}(T), \quad 1 \le m \le \frac{p-3}{2}$, be the odd Mirimanoff polynomials.
  - Let $E_\phi(t) = \{\phi_{2m+1}(T) \quad | \quad 1 \le m \le \frac{p-3}{2}, \quad \phi_{2m+1}(t) \equiv 0 \bmod p\}$.
  - We note $\phi_c(t) = Card(E_{\phi(t)})$.

- We compare our approach to known results:
  - Mirimanoff congruences : Let $t \equiv -\frac{x}{y} \bmod p$. We have $\phi_{2m+1}(t) \times B_{p-2m-1} \equiv 0 \bmod p, \quad 1 \le m \le \frac{p-3}{2}$: see for instance [39] (1B) p 145, which implies $\phi_c(t) \ge \frac{p-3}{2} - i_p$.
  - Trivially $r_p \le e_p$.
  - Herbrand theorem : $i_A \le i_p$ (see for instance [68] thm 6.17 p 101). Note that Herbrand theorem does not allow to conclude on $\phi_c(t)$, because if $B_{p-2m-1} \equiv 0 \bmod p$, the Mirimanoff congruence does not allow to determine $\phi_{2m+1}(t) \bmod p$.
  - Ribet/Kolyvagin converse of Herbrand theorem : $i_A = i_p$ and also $i_p \le r_p$ (see for instance [68] thm 6.18 p 102). Then these results allow to obtain $i_p \le r_p \le e_p$.
  - Then, from Mirimanoff's congruences and Ribet theorem simultaneously, we get

    $$\phi_c(t) \ge \frac{p-3}{2} - i_p \ge \frac{p-3}{2} - r_p \ge \frac{p-3}{2} - e_p.$$

    which is the result that we have found in corollary 9.7 p.101 by an **elementary method**.

- This result can also be obtained from corollary 10.15 p 198 of [68] and a Mazur-Wiles theorem $|\varepsilon_i| = p-$part of $B_{1,\omega^{-i}}$, see [68] p 300 and p 348.
- It is important to note that our proof uses only strictly elementary properties of Dedekind algebraic number field $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$; Proofs of Herbrand and Ribet/Kolyvagin converse of Herbrand theorem and Mazur-Wiles theorem uses $p-$adic theory, Hilbert class field theory, Modular forms, Euler systems, ... totally beyond material used in this paper.
- Note that our result gives $\phi_c(t) \geq \frac{p-3}{2} - e_p$. It is even possible to prove the stronger result $\phi_c(t) \geq \frac{p-3}{2} - r_p$ obtained from Mirimanoff/Herbrand/Ribet/Kolyvagin and even $\phi_c(t) \geq \frac{p-3}{2} - r_p^-$, always in our **strictly elementary approach**, (stronger because it is possible that $r_p^- < r_p < e_p$), see corollary 9.12 p.109.
- It is also possible to prove the stronger result $\phi_c(t) \geq \frac{p-3}{2} - r_p^-$ see for instance theorem 8.12 p. 87, which is better if $h^+ \equiv 0 \bmod p$.

9.7 A canonical form of congruences mod p for FLT first case-II

In this subsection, we give some other structure theorems on congruences $\bmod \pi^{p-1}$ of Fermat's equation.

Theorem 9.8. **** If the first case of FLT fails for p, then there exists exactly $\mu = r - 1$ different values m, $m \in \mathbb{N}$, $0 \leq m \leq \frac{p-3}{2}$, such that*

$$S_{2m+1}(J_r) \equiv 0 \text{ mod } p.$$

Proof. Consider always the set $U_f = \{u, \dots, u_f\}$ with u primitive root $\bmod p$ and the minimal set $J_r = \{u, \dots, u_r\}$. Let μ be the number of m, $m \in \mathbb{N}$, $0 \leq m \leq \frac{p-3}{2}$, such that $S_{2m+1}(J_r) \equiv 0 \bmod p$.

- If $\mu < r - 1$ then there are more than $\frac{p-1}{2} - r + 1$ Mirimanoff polynomials with $\phi^*_{2m+1}(t) \equiv 0 \bmod p$, $0 \leq m \leq \frac{p-3}{2}$, which contradicts previous theorem 9.6 p.98.
- If $\mu > r - 1$ then, from the first r congruences

$$\begin{aligned} &S_{2m_1+1}(J_r) \equiv 0 \bmod p, \\ &S_{2m_2+1}(J_r) \equiv 0 \bmod p, \\ &\vdots \\ &S_{2m_r+1}(J_r) \equiv 0 \bmod p, \end{aligned}$$

we get

$$\begin{aligned}
&n_1 + n_2 u^{2m_1+1} + \cdots + n_r u^{(r-1)(2m_1+1)} \equiv 0 \bmod p,\\
&n_1 + n_2 u^{2m_2+1} + \cdots + n_r u^{(r-1)(2m_2+1)} \equiv 0 \bmod p,\\
&\vdots\\
&n_1 + n_2 u^{2m_r+1} + \cdots + n_r u^{(r-1)(2m_r+1)} \equiv 0 \bmod p.
\end{aligned}$$

The determinant of this system of r congruences in the r indeterminates $n_1, n_2, \ldots, n_r$ is

$$\begin{vmatrix}
1 & u^{2m_1+1} & \ldots & u^{(r-1)(2m_1+1)}\\
1 & u^{2m_2+1} & \ldots & u^{(r-1)(2m_2+1)}\\
\vdots & \vdots & & \vdots\\
1 & u^{2m_r+1} & \ldots & u^{(r-1)(2m_r+1)}
\end{vmatrix}$$

a Vandermonde determinant with factors $(u^{2m_k+1} - u^{2m_l+1}) \not\equiv 0 \bmod p$ because u is a primitive root $\bmod p$. Therefore $n_1 \equiv n_2 \equiv \cdots \equiv n_r \equiv 0 \bmod p$, which contradicts hypothesis and achieves the proof.

□

We use in the sequel that value $\mu = r - 1$. Therefore, with $n_r = 1$ assumed without loss of generality, we are in the situation where we have a system of $r-1$ linear congruences in the $r-1$ indeterminates $n_1, \ldots, n_{r-1}$, not all zero, with no null second member,

$$\begin{aligned}
&n_1 + n_2 u^{2m_1+1} + \cdots + n_{r-1} u^{(r-2)(2m_1+1)} \equiv -u^{(r-1)(2m_1+1)} \bmod p\\
&n_1 + n_2 u^{2m_2+1} + \cdots + n_{r-1} u^{(r-2)(2m_2+1)} \equiv -u^{(r-1)(2m_2+1)} \bmod p\\
&\vdots\\
&n_1 + n_2 u^{2m_{r-1}+1} + \cdots + n_{r-1} u^{(r-2)(2m_{r-1}+1)} \equiv -u^{(r-1)(2m_{r-1}+1)} \bmod p.
\end{aligned} \tag{98}$$

with determinant

$$\Delta = \begin{vmatrix}
1 & u^{2m_1+1} & \ldots & u^{(r-2)(2m_1+1)}\\
1 & u^{2m_2+1} & \ldots & u^{(r-2)(2m_2+1)}\\
\vdots & \vdots & & \vdots\\
1 & u^{2m_{r-1}+1} & \ldots & u^{(r-2)(2m_{r-1}+1)}
\end{vmatrix} \not\equiv 0 \bmod p. \tag{99}$$

This result shall be used in section 11 p.116. Recall that the definitions used in the next corollary are in subsection 9.3 p.95.

Corollary 9.9. **** If the first case of Fermat's Last Theorem fails for* p*, then there exists* $r \in \mathbb{N}$ *depending only on* p *and* t *such that, for any primitive root* u *mod* p*,* $S_1(J_r) \equiv 0$ *mod* p *and for* $m = 1, \dots, \frac{p-3}{2}$*:*

- $\phi_{2m+1}(t) \times S_{2m+1}(J_r) \equiv 0$ *mod* p*,*
- *If* $\phi_{2m+1}(t) \equiv 0$ *mod* p *then* $S_{2m+1}(J_r) \not\equiv 0$ *mod* p*,*
- *If* $S_{2m+1}(J_r) \equiv 0$ *mod* p *then* $\phi_{2m+1}(t) \not\equiv 0$ *mod* p*.*

Proof. Immediate consequence of the two previous theorems and of relation (94) p.94 where $r(U_f)$ is defined. □

In the next theorem, we shall show that it is possible to compute explicitly $S_{2m+1}(J_r)$ and we shall give an explicit solution $\{l_1, \dots, l_r\}$ of the congruence mod p

$$\sum_{i=1}^{r} \frac{u_i l_i}{x + \zeta^{u_i} y} + \sum_{i=1}^{r} \frac{u_i l_i}{x + \zeta^{-u_i} l_i} \equiv 0 \text{ mod } p.$$

Theorem 9.10. ***** **An explicit computation of $S_{2m+1}(J_r)$.**

Let the set

$I_\phi = \{2m_i + 1 \quad | \quad i = 1, \dots, r-1, \quad \phi^*_{2m_i+1}(t) \not\equiv 0 \textit{ mod } p, \quad 0 \le m_i \le \frac{p-3}{2}\}$.

1. *Then an explicit formula for* $S_{2n+1}(J_r)$ *is :*

$$S_{2n+1}(J_r) = u_{2n+1} \times \prod_{i=1}^{r-1} (u_{2n+1} - u_{2m_i+1}). \tag{100}$$

2. *We have the equivalence*

$$\sum_{i=1}^{r}\frac{u_i l_i}{x+\zeta^{u_i}y}+\sum_{i=1}^{r}\frac{u_i l_i}{x+\zeta^{-u_i}y}\equiv 0 \ mod\ \pi^{p-1}$$

$$\Longleftrightarrow$$

$$S_{2n+1}(J_r)=u_{2n+1}\times\prod_{i=1}^{r-1}(u_{2n+1}-u_{2m_i+1})$$

$$\Longleftrightarrow$$

$$l_1\equiv(-1)^{r-1}\times\prod_{i=1}^{r-1}u_{2m_i+1}\ mod\ p,$$

$$\vdots$$

$$l_{r-1}\equiv(-1)\times\sum_{i=1}^{r-1}u_{2m_i+1}\ mod\ p,$$

$$l_r=1.$$

Proof.

1. Let $P_{2n+1}=\prod_{i=1}^{r-1}(u_{2n+1}-u_{2m_i+1})$. With a direct computation, we get

$$P_{2n+1}=\sum_{i=1}^{r}l_i\times u_{(i-1)(2n+1)},$$

$$l_1\equiv(-1)^{r-1}\times\prod_{i=1}^{r-1}u_{2m_i+1} \text{ mod } p,$$

$$\vdots$$

$$l_{r-1}\equiv(-1)\times\sum_{i=1}^{r-1}u_{2m_i+1} \text{ mod } p,$$

$$l_r=1.$$

We have $S_{2n+1}(J_r)=\sum_{i=1}^{r}n_i\times u_{i(2n+1)}$, where, without loss of generality, we can assume $n_r=1$. Then, suppose that $S_{2n+1}(J_r)\neq u_{2n+1}\times P_{2n+1}$ and search for a contradiction: Let us consider the expression $S'_{2n+1}=S_{2n+1}(J_r)-u_{2n+1}\times P_{2n+1}$. We have seen, theorem 9.1 p.89, that

$$\phi^*_{2n+1}(t)\times S_{2n+1}(J_r)\equiv 0 \text{ mod } p,\quad n=0,\dots,\frac{p-3}{2}.$$

The definition of P_{2n+1} implies that

$$\phi^*_{2n+1}(t) \times u_{2n+1} \times P_{2n+1} \equiv 0 \text{ mod } p, \quad n = 0, \dots, \frac{p-3}{2}.$$

Therefore

$$\phi^*_{2n+1}(t) \times S'_{2n+1} \equiv 0 \text{ mod } p, \quad n = 0, \dots, \frac{p-3}{2}.$$

and so

$$\phi^*_{2n+1}(t) \times \sum_{i=1}^{r-1} (n_i - l_i) \times u_{i(2n+1)} \equiv 0 \text{ mod } p, \quad n = 0, \dots, \frac{p-3}{2}.$$

From lemma 9.2 p.92 we get

$$\sum_{i=1}^{r-1} \frac{u_i(n_i - l_i)}{(x + \zeta^{u_i} y)} + \sum_{i=1}^{r-1} \frac{u_i(n_i - l_i)}{(x + \zeta^{-u_i} y)} \equiv 0 \text{ mod } p,$$

which contradicts minimality of r.

2. Immediate consequence of 1)

$\square$

9.8 A comparison with Mirimanoff

Let $t \equiv -\frac{x}{y}$ mod p. We have for $m = 1, 2, \dots, \frac{p-3}{2}$ the two congruences mod p :

- $\phi_{2m+1}(t) \times B_{p-1-2m} \equiv 0$ mod p, see [39] p145.
- $\phi_{2m+1}(t) \times S_{2m+1}(J_r) \equiv 0$ mod , corollary 9.9 p.105, where $S_{2m+1}(V_r) = \sum_{i=1}^{r} u_{i(2m+1)} n_i$ mod p is, for u primitive root mod p given, explicitly computable.

Note that, in our result, it is not possible to have simultaneously $\phi_{2m+1}(t) \equiv 0$ mod p and $S_{2m+1}(J_r) \equiv 0$ mod p. In opposite, we have not seen in the literature if it is possible or no to have simultaneously $\phi_{2m+1}(t) \equiv 0$ mod p and $B_{p-1-2m} \equiv 0$ mod p. The section 11 p.116 of this article gives an example of importance of the property: the two congruences $\phi_{2m+1}(t) \equiv 0$ mod p and $S_{2m+1}(J_r) \equiv 0$ mod p are not simultaneously possible.

Related to this subject, we have only found the beautiful results of F. Thaine, relating even Mirimanoff polynomials and even Bernoulli numbers:

- Let h^+ be the class number of $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta+\zeta^{-1})$. If $h^+\not\equiv 0 \mod p$ (in particular case of Vandiver conjecture) and if $B_{p-1-2m}\equiv 0 \mod p, \quad 1\leq m\leq \frac{p-3}{2}$ and if the first case of Fermat's Last Theorem fails, then $\phi_{p-1-2m}(t)\equiv 0 \mod p$. see ([59]) prop 3 p 141. This results allows a symmetric formulation : if $h^+\not\equiv 0 \mod p$ then
  - if $B_{p-1-2m}\equiv 0 \mod p$ then $\phi_{p-1-2m}(t)\equiv 0 \mod p$;
  - if $B_{p-1-2m}\not\equiv 0 \mod p$ then $\phi_{2m+1}(t)\equiv 0 \mod p$.

  Observe that, from Mirimanoff, we know already that $\phi_{2m+1}(t)\times\phi_{p-1-2m}(t)\equiv 0 \mod p$, but Thaine's result is more precise.
- If $\prod_{i=1}^{p-1}(1-\zeta^i)^{i^{2m}}$ is not a pth power in $\mathbb{Z}[\zeta]$, if $B_{p-1-2m}\equiv 0 \mod p$ and if the first case of Fermat's Last Theorem fails, then $\phi_{p-1-2m}\equiv 0 \mod p$, see ([60]) cor. p 299.

9.9 A connection between Mirimanoff congruences and $p-$rank of the class group of $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)/\mathbb{Q}$

Let $t\in\mathbb{N}, \quad t\equiv -\frac{x}{y} \mod p$. Let $\phi_c(t)$ be the number of odd Mirimanoff polynomials $\phi_{2m+1}(T), \quad m=1,\dots,\frac{p-3}{2}$, with $\phi_{2m+1}(t)\equiv 0 \mod p$. Let r_p be the $p-$rank of the class group of $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$. We shall prove that $\phi_c(t)\geq \frac{p-3}{2}-r_p$.

Theorem 9.11. **** Let r_p be the $p-$rank of the class group C_p of $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$. Let r be the p-rank of Fermat congruences defined in the section (9.3). Then $r\leq r_p+2$.*

Proof. Suppose that $r>r_p+2$ and search for a contradiction : Recall that $(x+\zeta y)\mathbb{Z}[\zeta]=\mathbf{s}^p$ where $\mathbf{s}$ is an integral ideal. Let r_1 be the p-rank of the p-subgroup C_p of the class group of $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)/\mathbb{Q}$ generated by action of $Gal(\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)/\mathbb{Q})$ on the class group $<Cl(\sigma(\mathbf{s})>$. We have $r_1\leq r_p$. From elementary properties of the p-class group, it is possible to find $l_1,l_2,\dots,l_{r_1+1}$, such that $\prod_{i=1}^{r_1+1}(x+\zeta^{u_i}y)^{l_i}=\zeta^u\times\eta\times\gamma^p$ with $u\in\mathbb{N}$ and $\gamma\in\mathbb{Z}[\zeta]$. It is then possible to find $n_i, \quad i=1,2,\dots,r_1+2$, such that

$$\prod_{i=1}^{r_1+2}(x+\zeta^{u_i}y)^{n_i}=\eta_1\times\gamma_1^p, \quad \eta_1\in\mathbb{Z}[\zeta+\zeta^{-1}]^*, \quad \gamma_1\in\mathbb{Z}[\zeta],$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^{r_1+2}\frac{u_il_i\zeta^{u_i}}{(x+\zeta^{u_i}y)}+\sum_{i=1}^{r_1+2}\frac{u_il_i\zeta^{-u_i}}{(x+\zeta^{-u_i}y)}\equiv 0 \mod p.$$

Therefore, from the minimality of r in the definition 9.3 p.95, we get

$$r_1+2\geq r, \tag{101}$$

and hence

$$r_p + 2 \geq r_1 + 2 \geq r. \tag{102}$$

$\square$

Corollary 9.12. **** Let r_p be the $p-$rank of the class group of $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$. Suppose that FLT first case fails for p. Let $t \in \mathbb{N}, \quad t \equiv -\frac{x}{y}$ mod p. Let $\phi_{2m+1}(T), \quad m = 1, \dots, \frac{p-3}{2}$, be the odd Mirimanoff polynomials. Let $\phi_c(t)$ be the number of $\phi_{2m+1}(t) \equiv 0$ mod $p, \quad m = 1, \dots, \frac{p-3}{2}$. Then $\phi_c(t) \geq \frac{p-3}{2} - r_p$.*

Proof. From theorem 9.6 p.98, we have $\phi_c(t) = \frac{p-1}{2} - r + 1$. Then we apply theorem 9.11 p.108. $\square$

10 FLT first case: Mirimanoff in intermediate fields K with $\mathbb{Q} \subset K \subset \mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$. Part I.

In this section we shall obtain some relations on Mirimanoff polynomials with a systematic study of FLT in intermediate fields between $\mathbb{Q}$ and $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$.

10.1 Some definitions

Let us recall or give some new notations used in this section.

- u is a primitive root $\mod p$; we note u_i for $u^i \mod p$.
- $\sigma : \mathbb{Q}(\zeta) \to \mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$ is a $\mathbb{Q}$-isomorphism defined by $\sigma(\zeta) = \zeta^u$, where $<\sigma>= Gal(\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)/\mathbb{Q})$.
- Let $g, \quad g \in \mathbb{N}, \quad g > 1, \quad \frac{p-1}{2} \equiv 0 \mod g$.
- We have defined the odd Mirimanoff's polynomials by

$$\phi_{2m+1}(T) = T + 2^{2m} \times T^2 + \dots + (p-1)^{2m} \times T^{p-1}, \quad m = 0, \dots, \frac{p-3}{2}.$$

- We recall the definition of $\phi^*_{2m+1}(T)$ in relation (89) p.92 by

$$\phi^*_{2m+1}(T) = \phi_{2m+1}(T), \quad m = 1, \dots, \frac{p-3}{2}, \quad \phi^*_1(T) = 1.$$

- Let $M_g = \frac{p-1}{2g}$. Therefore, from hypothesis on g, $M_g \in \mathbb{N}$.
- Let us suppose, in this section, that

$$M_g = \frac{p-1}{2g} \geq e_p + 2. \tag{103}$$

  where e_p is defined, from the class number h of $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$, by the relation $h = p^{e_p} \times h_2, \quad h_2 \not\equiv 0 \mod p$.
- Let K be the field, $\mathbb{Q} \subset K \subset \mathbb{Q}(\zeta), \quad [\mathbb{Q}(\zeta) : K] = \frac{p-1}{g}, \quad [K : \mathbb{Q}] = g$.
- Let us consider the K-isomorphism $\sigma^g : \mathbb{Q}(\zeta) \to \mathbb{Q}(\zeta), \quad \zeta \to \zeta^{u_g}$.
- Let us consider the set of ideals $\sigma^{gi}(\mathbf{s}), \quad i = 0, \dots, \frac{p-1}{g} - 1$.
- Recall that, for the Fermat equation $x^p + y^p + z^p = 0$, we set $t \equiv -\frac{y}{x} \mod p$.

10.2 Results on Mirimanoff in intermediate fields K, $\mathbb{Q} \subset K \subset \mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$

The proof of theorem 8.2 p.79, that we have explained, when $\frac{p-1}{2} \geq f \geq e_p + 2$, for the $\mathbb{Q}$-isomorphism $\sigma : \mathbb{Q}(\zeta) \rightarrow \mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$ and the set of ideals $\sigma^i(\mathbf{s}) \quad i = 0, \dots, p-2$, can be strictly applied, *mutatis mutandis*, when $\frac{p-1}{2g} \geq f_g \geq e_p + 2$, to the K-isomorphism $\sigma^g : \mathbb{Q}(\zeta) \longrightarrow \mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$ and to the set of ideals $\sigma^{gi}(\mathbf{s}), \quad i = 0, \dots, \frac{p-1}{g} - 1$. Then the theorem 8.2 p.79 gives in that case:

Theorem 10.1. *Let* $h = p^{e_p} \times h_2, \quad h_2 \not\equiv 0 \bmod p$*, be the class number of* $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)/\mathbb{Q}$*. Let* $g \in \mathbb{N}, \quad g \geq 1, \quad \frac{p-1}{2} \equiv 0$ *mod* g *with* $\frac{p-1}{2g} \geq e_p + 2$*. Let* $f_g \in \mathbb{N}, \quad \frac{p-1}{2g} \geq f_g \geq e_p + 2$*. Then, there exists at least one set of* f_g *natural numbers* $L(I_{f_g})$ *not all simultaneously null*

$$L(I_{f_g}) = \{ \ l_i \mid \quad l_i \in \mathbb{N}, \quad 1 \leq i \leq f_g, \quad 0 \leq l_i \leq p-1 \ \} \tag{104}$$

such that simultaneously,

$$\prod_{i=1}^{f_g} \frac{(x + \zeta^{u_{gi}} y)^{l_i}}{(x + \zeta^{-u_{gi}} y)^{l_i}} = \beta^p, \quad \beta \in \mathbb{Q}(\zeta), \quad \beta \neq 1,$$
$$\prod_{i=1}^{f_g} (x + \zeta^{u_{gi}} y)^{l_i} - \prod_{i=1}^{f_g} (x + \zeta^{-u_{gi}} y)^{l_i} \equiv 0 \ \mathit{mod} \ \pi^{p+1}.$$

Proof. The same proof as proposition 2 p.76 and theorem 8.2 p.79 can be applied here; we observe only that $U_{f_g} = \{u^{gi} \quad | \quad i = 0, \dots, f_g - 1\}$ verifies the conditions assumed for I_f sets:

$$u^{gi_1} \not\equiv u^{gi_2} \bmod p, \quad i_1 \neq i_2,$$
$$\{u_{gi} \quad | \quad i = 1, \dots, f_g - 1\} \neq \{p - u_{gi} \quad | \quad i = 1, \dots, f_g - 1\}.$$

because u is a primitive root $\bmod p$ and $gi_1 < g \times \frac{p-1}{2g} = \frac{p-1}{2}$ and $gi_2 < g \times \frac{p-1}{2g} = \frac{p-1}{2}$. □

Remark: Observe that if $g = 1$ it is the theorem 8.2 p.79.

10.2.1 Definitions connected with sets U_{f_g}.

This definition is important for the sequel of this section. This definition is the translation for σ^g of the definition given in relation (95) p.95 for σ. There exists a minimum Fermat congruence **rank** $r_g \in \mathbb{N}$ verifying

$$\begin{aligned}
&r_g \leq e_p + 2 \leq \frac{p-1}{2g}),\\
&u \in \mathbb{N}, \quad \text{primitive root} \mod p,\\
&J_{r_g} = \{u_{gi} \quad | \quad i = 1, \dots, r_g\},\\
&N(J_{r_g}) = \{n_1, \dots, n_{r_g}\}, \quad n_1 \not\equiv 0 \bmod p, \quad n_{r_g} = 1,\\
&\sum_{i=1}^{r_g} \frac{u_{gi} n_i}{(x + \zeta^{u_{gi}} y)} + \sum_{i=1}^{r_g} \frac{u_{gi} n_i}{(x + \zeta^{-u_{gi}} y)} \equiv 0 \bmod p,
\end{aligned} \tag{105}$$

these relations being impossible for $r'_g < r_g$.

For this value r_g, let us denote

$$S_{g(2m+1)}(J_{r_g}) \equiv \sum_{i=1}^{r_g} u_{gi(2m+1)} \times n_i \bmod p. \tag{106}$$

10.2.2 Instanciation of σ-theorem to σ^g-theorems

The instanciation of *foundation* theorem (9.1) becomes in that case:

Theorem 10.2.

$$\begin{aligned}
&S_g(J_{r_g}) \equiv 0 \ mod \ p,\\
&S_{g(2m+1)}(J_{r_g}) \times \phi^*_{2m+1}(t) \equiv 0 \ mod \ p, \quad m = 0, \dots, \frac{p-3}{2}.
\end{aligned}$$

Proof.

1. Similar to lemma 8.7 p.84 with σ^g in place of σ and u_g in place of u.
2. Similar to the proof of theorem 9.1 p.89 with σ^g in place of σ and u_g in place of u.

□

We show that theorems 9.6 p.98 can be *partially* applied here, with *mutatis mutandis*, $f \rightarrow f_g$, $r \rightarrow r_g$.

Theorem 10.3. **** Let $t \equiv -\frac{y}{x}$ mod p. Let r_g defined in the relation (105) p 112. If the First Case of Fermat's Last Theorem fails for p, then*

1. *there exists* **exactly** $\frac{p-1}{2g} - r_g + 1$ *different values m,* $m \in \mathbb{N}$, $1 \leq m \leq \frac{p-1}{2g} - 1$, *such that we have for m the g Mirimanoff polynomial congruences:*

$$\phi^*_{2m+1+\alpha(p-1)/g}(t) \equiv 0 \ mod \ p, \quad \alpha = 0, \dots, g-1.$$

2. *there exists* **exactly** $r_g - 1$ *different values* m, $\quad m \in \mathbb{N}, \quad 1 \leq m \leq \frac{p-1}{2g} - 1$, *such that we have for* m **at least** *one* $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}, \quad 0 \leq \alpha \leq g-1$ *with the Mirimanoff polynomial congruence:*

$$\phi^*_{2m+1+\alpha(p-1)/g}(t) \not\equiv 0 \text{ mod } p.$$

Proof. We duplicate, *mutatis mutandis*, the proof of theorem 9.6 p.98.

1. We have $J_{r_g} = \{u_g, u_{2g}, \dots, u_{gr_g}\}$ where u is a primitive root $\bmod p$.

   - Observe that, from relation (105) p.112, we have $r_g \leq f_g \leq \frac{p-1}{2g} = M_g$. Let $\beta = 2\alpha \times M_g$.
   - Show that there are at least $M_g - r_g + 1$ different values m, $\quad 0 \leq m \leq M_g - 1$, such that $S_{g(\beta+2m+1)}(J_{r_g}) \not\equiv 0 \bmod p$. Suppose that this assertion is false and search for a contradiction : then there exists at most $M_g - r_g$ different values m, $\quad 0 \leq m \leq M_g - 1$ such that $S_{g(\beta+2m+1)}(J_{r_g}) \not\equiv 0 \bmod p$. Then there exists at least r_g different values m_i, $\quad 0 \leq m_i \leq M_g - 1, \quad i = 1, \dots, r_g$, such that

$$\begin{aligned}
&S_{g(\beta+2m_1+1)}(J_{r_g}) \equiv 0 \bmod p,\\
&S_{g(\beta+2m_2+1)}(J_{r_g}) \equiv 0 \bmod p,\\
&\vdots\\
&S_{g(\beta+2m_{r_g}+1)}(J_{r_g}) \equiv 0 \bmod p,
\end{aligned}$$

hence

$$\begin{aligned}
&n_1 + n_2 u^{g(\beta+2m_1+1)} + \dots + n_{r_g} u^{g(r_g-1)(\beta+2m_1+1)} \equiv 0 \bmod p,\\
&n_1 + n_2 u^{g(\beta+2m_2+1)} + \dots + n_{r_g} u^{g(r_g-1)(\beta+2m_2+1)} \equiv 0 \bmod p,\\
&\vdots\\
&n_1 + n_2 u^{g(\beta+2m_{r_g}+1)} + \dots + n_{r_g} u^{g(r_g-1)(\beta+2m_{r_g}+1)} \equiv 0 \bmod p.
\end{aligned}$$

The determinant of this system of r_g congruences in the r_g indeterminates $n_1, n_2, \dots, n_{r_g}$, after simplification by a power of $u \not\equiv 0 \bmod p$ not intervening in $\bmod p$ congruences,

$$(107) \qquad \begin{vmatrix}
1 & u^{g(2m_1+1)} & \dots & u^{g(r_g-1)(2m_1+1)}\\
1 & u^{g(2m_2+1)} & \dots & u^{g(r_g-1)(2m_2+1)}\\
\vdots & \vdots & & \vdots\\
1 & u^{g(2m_{r_g}+1)} & \dots & u^{g(r_g-1)(2m_{r_g}+1)}
\end{vmatrix}$$

is a Vandermonde determinant with factors $(u^{g(2m_k+1)} - u^{g(2m_l+1)}) \not\equiv 0 \bmod p$ because u is a primitive root $\bmod p$ and because $g(2m_i+1) < p-1, \quad i = 1, \dots, r_g$: in fact $g(2m_i+1) \leq g(2(M_g-1)+1) = g(2(\frac{p-1}{2g} - 1)+1) = p-1-g$. Therefore $n_1 = n_2 = \dots = n_{r_g} = 0$, which contradicts hypothesis on $N(J_{r_g})$.

- Then, for m varying through a set $M \subset \{1, \dots, \frac{p-1}{2g} - 1\}, \quad Card(M) = \frac{p-1}{2g} - r_g + 1$ and for $\alpha = 0, \dots, g-1$, we have

  $$S_{g(2m+1+\alpha(p-1)/g)}(J_{r_g}) \equiv S_{g(2m+1)}(J_{r_g}) \not\equiv 0 \bmod p,$$

  and from foundation theorem

  $$\phi^*_{2m+1+\alpha(p-1)/g}(t) \equiv 0 \bmod p, \quad \alpha = 0, \dots, g-1.$$

2. Show secondly that there are at most $\frac{p-1}{2g} - r_g + 1$ different values $m, \quad 0 \leq m \leq M_g - 1$, such that

   $$\phi^*_{2m+1+\alpha(p-1)/g}(t) \equiv 0 \bmod p, \quad 0 \leq m \leq M_g - 1, \quad \alpha = 0, \dots, g-1.$$

   Suppose that this assertion is false and search for a contradiction : Then there exist at least $\frac{p-1}{2g} - r_g + 2$ different values $m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

   $$\phi^*_{2m+1+\alpha(p-1)/g}(t) \equiv 0 \bmod p, \quad 0 \leq m \leq M_g - 1, \quad \alpha = 0, \dots, g-1.$$

   Then there exists at most $\nu \leq r_g - 2$ values $m_1 = 0, m_2 \neq 0, \dots, m_\nu \neq 0$ with at least one $\alpha_i \in \mathbb{N}, \quad 0 \leq \alpha_i \leq g-1, \quad i = 1, \dots, \nu$, such that

   $$\begin{aligned} &\phi^*_{2m_1+1+\alpha_1(p-1)/g}(t) \not\equiv 0 \bmod p \\ &\vdots \\ &\phi^*_{2m_\nu+1+\alpha_\nu(p-1)/g}(t) \not\equiv 0 \bmod p. \end{aligned}$$

   It is possible to find $l_1, l_2, \dots, l_\nu, l_{\nu+1} = 1 \in \mathbb{N}$, not all zero such that

   $$\begin{aligned} &l_1 + l_2 u^{g(2m_1+1)} + \dots + l_\nu u^{(\nu-1)g(2m_1+1)} + l_{\nu+1} u^{\nu g(2m_1+1)} \equiv 0 \bmod p, \\ &l_1 + l_2 u^{g(2m_2+1)} + \dots + l_\nu u^{(\nu-1)g(2m_2+1)} + l_{\nu+1} u^{\nu g(2m_2+1)} \equiv 0 \bmod p, \\ &\vdots \\ &l_1 + l_2 u^{g(2m_\nu+1)} + \dots + l_\nu u^{(\nu-1)g(2m_\nu+1)} + l_{\nu+1} u^{\nu g(2m_\nu+1)} \equiv 0 \bmod p. \end{aligned}$$

   because the determinant

   $$\begin{vmatrix} 1 & u^{g(2m_1+1)} & \dots & u^{(\nu-1)g(2m_1+1)} \\ 1 & u^{g(2m_2+1)} & \dots & u^{(\nu-1)g(2m_2+1)} \\ \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots \\ 1 & u^{g(2m_\nu+1)} & \dots & u^{(\nu-1)g(2m_\nu+1)} \end{vmatrix} \tag{108}$$

is a Vandermonde determinant with factors $(u^{g(2m_k+1)} - u^{g(2m_l+1)}) \not\equiv 0 \mod p$, because u is a primitive root $\mod p$ and $g(2m_i+1) < p-1, \quad i = 1, \dots, \nu$. Therefore we have,

$$\begin{aligned}
&J_{\nu+1} = \{u^g, u^{2g}, \dots, u^{(\nu+1)g}\}\\
&L(J_{\nu+1}) = \{l_1, l_2, \dots, l_{\nu+1}\}\\
&S_{g(2m_1+1)}(J_{\nu+1}) \equiv 0 \text{ mod } p\\
&S_{g(2m_2+1)}(J_{\nu+1}) \equiv 0 \text{ mod } p\\
&\vdots\\
&S_{g(2m_\nu+1)}(J_{\nu+1}) \equiv 0 \text{ mod } p
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, for $m \in M = \{m_1 = 0, m_2, \dots, m_\nu\}$, we have $S_{g(2m+1)}(J_{\nu+1}) \equiv 0 \text{ mod } p$ and for $m \in \{0, 1, \dots, \frac{p-1}{2g} - 1 - M\}$, we have

$$\phi^*_{2m+1+\alpha(p-1)/g}(t) \equiv 0 \text{ mod } p, \quad \alpha = 0, \dots, g-1,$$

and hence

$$\begin{aligned}
&S_{g(2m+1)}(J_{\nu+1}) \times \phi^*_{2m+1+\alpha(p-1)/g}(t) \equiv 0 \text{ mod } p,\\
&m = 0, 1, \dots, \frac{p-1}{2g} - 1, \quad \alpha = 0, \dots, g-1,
\end{aligned}$$

which leads to

$$S_{g(2m+1)}(J_{\nu+1}) \times \phi^*_{2m+1}(t) \equiv 0 \text{ mod } p, \quad m = 0, 1, \dots, \frac{p-3}{2}.$$

From lemma 9.2 p.92, this leads to the relation

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\nu+1} \frac{u_{gi} n_i}{(x + \zeta^{u_{gi}} y)} + \sum_{i=1}^{\nu+1} \frac{u_{gi} n_i}{(x + \zeta^{-u_{gi}} y)} \equiv 0 \text{ mod } p,$$

which contradicts the minimal value of $r_g > \nu + 1$.

From first part of the proof, r_g depends only of the number of Mirimanoff polynomials $\phi_{2m+1}(T), \quad 0 \le m \le \frac{p-3}{2}$, with $\phi_{2m+1}(t) \equiv 0 \text{ mod } p$ and does not depend on the primitive root u mod p.

- From $\phi^*_1(t) = 1$ and $\phi^*_{2m+1}(t) = \phi_{2m+1}(t)$ for $m = 1, \dots, \frac{p-3}{2}$, we deduce that the number of $m, \quad 1 \le m \le \frac{p-3}{2}$ with $\phi_{2m+1}(t) \equiv 0 \text{ mod } p$ is the number of $m, \quad 0 \le m \le \frac{p-3}{2}$ with $\phi^*_{2m+1}(t) \equiv 0 \text{ mod } p$, which completes the proof.

□

11 FLT First case: Mirimanoff in intermediate fields K with $\mathbb{Q} \subset K \subset \mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$. Part II

This section deals, with another point of view, of Mirimanoff polynomials in intermediate fields $K, \quad \mathbb{Q} \subset K \subset \mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$.

- The first subsection deals of Gauss periods for FLT.
- The second subsection gives an example of application: if p is prime, $p \equiv 1 \bmod 3$, does not divide the class number of $K/\mathbb{Q}, \quad [K:\mathbb{Q}] = \frac{p-1}{3}$, then first case of FLT holds for p.
- The third subsection is a study of FLT first case in quadratic subfield of $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$.

11.1 First case of FLT and Gauss periods

In this subsection, we apply Gauss periods of cyclotomic equations to generalize foundation theorem to intermediate fields $\mathbb{Q} \subset K \subset \mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$, see Ribenboim [39], p 115, to the Fermat's equation $x^p + y^p + z^p = 0, \quad xyz \not\equiv 0 \bmod p$ assumed as hypothesis. We have shown the foundation theorem 9.1 89

$$\phi_{2m+1}(t) \times \sum_{i=0}^{r-1} u_{(2m+1)i} \times l_i \equiv 0 \bmod p, \quad m = 1, \dots, \frac{p-3}{2}.$$

where we recall that $t \equiv -\frac{x}{y} \bmod p$ and $\phi_{2m+1}(T), \quad m = 1, \dots, \frac{p-3}{2}$ are the odd Mirimanoff polynomials. In this section, we shall generalize foundation theorem to intermediate fields $K, \quad \mathbb{Q} \subset K \subset \mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$, with $[K:\mathbb{Q}] = g, \quad p-1 = g \times f$, where f is odd.

Theorem 11.1. **** Translation of Mirimanoff congruences in intermediate fields*

Let K be an intermediate field, $\mathbb{Q} \subset K \subset \mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$, with $[K:\mathbb{Q}] = g, \quad p-1 = g \times f$, where f is odd. Let r_K be the p-rank of the class group of $K/\mathbb{Q}$. There exists a minimal $r_A \in \mathbb{N}, \quad r_A \le r_K, \quad r_A < g$ such that the odd Mirimanoff polynomials verify the system of congruences mod p

$$\phi_{f(2n+1)}(t) \times \{\sum_{j=0}^{r_A} u_{jf^2(2n+1)} \times l_j\} \equiv 0 \ mod\ p, \quad 2n+1 = 1, 3, \dots, g-1, \tag{109}$$

where $l_i \in \mathbb{N}, \quad 0 \le l_i \le p-1, \quad l_0 \ne 0, \quad l_{r_A} \ne 0$.

Proof.

- Let us consider the algebraic integer $A = \prod_{i=0}^{f-1}(x+\zeta^{u_{gi}}y) \in \mathbb{Z}[\zeta]$. We have $A \in K$.

- Let $O_K = K \cap \mathbb{Z}[\zeta]$ be the ring of integers of K. We have $AO_K = U^p$, where U is an ideal of O_K. Let ρ_A be the p-rank of the action of $G = Gal(\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)/\mathbb{Q})$ on the ideal class group $< Cl(U\mathbb{Z}[\zeta]) >$ subgroup of the p-group C_p. Clearly $\rho_A \leq r_K$ and $\rho_A < g$ because, for all ideals $\mathbf{b} \subset K$, then $N_{K/\mathbb{Q}}(\mathbf{b})$ is principal. It is possible to find $l_j, \quad 0 \leq l_j \leq p-1, \quad l_0 = 1, \qquad l_{\rho_A} \not\equiv 0 \mod p, \quad j = 0, \dots, \rho_A$, such that $\prod_{j=0}^{\rho_A} \sigma^{((p-1)/g))\times j}(U)^{l_j}$ is a principal ideal of O_K and so, observing that $f = \frac{p-1}{g}$,

$$Q = \prod_{j=0}^{\rho_A} \sigma^{fj}(A)^{l_j} = \zeta^v \times \eta \times \gamma^p,$$
$$\gamma \in \mathbb{Z}[\zeta], \quad \eta \in \mathbb{Z}[\zeta+\zeta^{-1}]^*, \quad v \in \mathbb{N}, \quad 0 \leq v \leq p-1.$$

- Then, we obtain

$$Q = \prod_{j=0}^{\rho_A}\prod_{i=0}^{f-1}(x+\zeta^{u_{gi+fj}}y)^{l_j} = \zeta^v \times \eta \times \gamma^p.$$

Then it is possible to find a minimal natural integer $\mod \pi^{p+1}$ Fermat congruence rank $r_A \leq \rho_A$ such that

$$\prod_{j=0}^{r_A}\prod_{i=0}^{f-1}(x+\zeta^{u_{gi+fj}}y)^{l_j} - \prod_{j=0}^{r_A}\prod_{i=0}^{f-1}(x+\zeta^{-u_{gi+fj}}y)^{l_j} \equiv 0 \mod \pi^{p+1},$$
$$l_i \in \mathbb{N}, \quad 0 \leq l_i \leq p-1, \quad l_0 \neq 0, \quad l_{r_A} \neq 0.$$

Then, we apply foundation theorem 9.1 p.89, mutatis mutandis in this situation, to get for $m = 1, \dots, \frac{p-3}{2}$,

$$\phi_{2m+1}(t) \times (\sum_{j=0}^{r_A}\sum_{i=0}^{f-1} u_{(2m+1)(gi+fj)} \times l_j) \equiv 0 \mod p,$$

so

(110)
$$\phi^*_{2m+1}(t) \times (\sum_{i=0}^{f-1} u_{(2m+1)gi}) \times (\sum_{j=0}^{r_A} u_{(2m+1)fj} \times l_j) \equiv 0 \mod p, \quad m = 0, \dots, \frac{p-3}{2}.$$

which is the translation of foundation theorem 9.6 p.98 in intermediate field K.

- Let us evaluate $\sum_{i=0}^{f-1} u_{(2m+1)gi}$:
  - If $(2m+1)\times g \equiv 0 \bmod (p-1)$, then $\sum_{i=0}^{f-1} u_{(2m+1)gi} \equiv f \not\equiv 0 \bmod p$. In that case $2m+1 = f(2n+1), \quad 1 \le 2n+1 < g$.
  - If $(2m+1)\times g \not\equiv 0 \bmod (p-1)$, then $\sum_{i=0}^{f-1} u_{(2m+1)gi} \equiv \frac{u^{(2m+1)gf}-1}{u^{(2m+1)g}-1} \equiv \frac{u^{(2m+1)(p-1)}-1}{u^{(2m+1)g}-1} \equiv 0 \bmod p$.
- Then we obtain $\phi_{f(2n+1)}(t)\times(\sum_{j=0}^{r_A} u_{j(2n+1)f^2}\times l_j) \equiv 0 \bmod p, \quad 1 \le 2n+1 < g$.

$\square$

Example : Suppose that $g = 6$, that $p-1 \not\equiv 0 \bmod 3^2, \quad p-1 \not\equiv 0 \bmod 2^2$ and that $p \| h(K/\mathbb{Q})$, so $r_A = 1$. Then this generalization of foundation theorem (11.1) gives, with $f = \frac{p-1}{6}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\phi_{(p-1)/6}(t) \times (l_0 + u_{((p-1)/6)^2} \times l_1) \equiv 0 \bmod p,\\
&\phi_{3(p-1)/6}(t) \times (l_0 + u_{3((p-1)/6)^2} \times l_1) \equiv 0 \bmod p,\\
&\phi_{5(p-1)/6}(t) \times (l_0 + u_{5((p-1)/6)^2} \times l_1) \equiv 0 \bmod p.
\end{aligned}$$

Then, this implies that at least two of the values $\phi_{(p-1)/6}(t), \phi_{3(p-1)/6}(t), \phi_{5(p-1)/6}(t)$ are null $\bmod p$ because, from hypothesis on $p-1$, we get $2\times(\frac{p-1}{6})^2 \not\equiv 0 \bmod p-1$, so $u_{3(p-1)/6)^2} - u_{(p-1)/6)^2} \not\equiv 0 \bmod p$ and also $4\times(\frac{p-1}{6})^2 \not\equiv 0 \bmod p-1$, so $u_{5(p-1)/6)^2} - u_{(p-1)/6)^2} \not\equiv 0 \bmod p$.

Remark : Let a field $K \subset \mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$. Let r_K be the p-rank of the class group $K/\mathbb{Q}$; let r_p be the p-rank of the class group $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)/\mathbb{Q}$; the interest of this theorem is that $r_K \le r_p$ and that $r_K \le [K:\mathbb{Q}]$: so we have now to consider system of linear congruences of rank smaller than r_K, very more easily solvable that a system of r_p conguences in $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)/\mathbb{Q}$. We have translated Mirimanoff congruences in intermediate fields $K/\mathbb{Q}$.

Corollary 11.2. **** Let $p-1 = f\times g$ with f odd. Let K be the intermediate field $\mathbb{Q} \subset K \subset \mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$ and $[K:\mathbb{Q}] = g$. Suppose that p does not divide the class number of $K/\mathbb{Q}$. Then we have the Mirimanoff's polynomials congruences*

$$\phi_{f(2n+1)}(t) \equiv 0 \textit{ mod } p, \quad 2n+1 = 1,3,5,\dots,g-1.$$

Proof. Apply theorem 11.1 p.116 with here $r_A = 0$. $\square$

Theorem 11.3. **** Let $f, g \in \mathbb{N}$, with $f\times g = p-1$, $Gcd(f,g) = d$ and f odd. Let r_A be the rank defined in theorem 11.1 p.116. Then*

$$\begin{aligned}
&Card(\{\phi_{f(2n+1)}(t) \not\equiv 0 \textit{ mod } p \quad | \quad n = 0,\dots,\frac{g-2d}{2d}\}) = r_A,\\
&Card(\{\phi_{f(2n+1)}(t) \equiv 0 \textit{ mod } p \quad | \quad n = 0,\dots,\frac{g-2d}{2d}\}) = \frac{g-2d}{2d} + 1 - r_A.
\end{aligned} \tag{111}$$

Moreover $r_A \leq r_K$ where r_K is the p-rank of the class group of K, $\quad [K:\mathbb{Q}] = g$.

Proof. Let us denote

$$S_{f(2n+1)} \equiv \sum_{j=0}^{r_A} u_{jf^2(2n+1)} \times l_j \text{ mod } p, \quad n = 0, \dots, \frac{g-2d}{2d},$$

where r_A is the minimal natural integer which verifies the relation (110) p.117. The foundation theorem 9.1 p.89 is the relation (110) p.117 which implies for $2m+1 = f(2n+1), \quad n = 0, \dots, \frac{g-2d}{2d}$:

$$\phi_{f(2n+1)}(t) \times S_{f(2n+1)} \equiv 0 \text{ mod } p.$$

Observe that $u_{f^2(2n+1)} \not\equiv u_{f^2(2n'+1)}, \quad n = 0, \dots, \frac{g-2d}{2d}$ mod p, because $f^2(2n+1) \not\equiv 0$ mod $f^2(2n'+1)$ mod $p-1 \Leftrightarrow f(2n+1) \not\equiv f(2n'+1)$ mod $g \Leftrightarrow 2n+1 \not\equiv 2n'+1$ mod $\frac{g}{d}$, which is not possible from hypothesis $0 \leq n, n' \leq \frac{g-2d}{2d}$. It is not possible that $S_{f(2n_i+1)} = \sum_{j=0}^{r_A} u_{jf^2(2n_i+1)} \not\equiv 0$ mod p, $\quad i = 1, \dots, r_A$, because $\phi_{f(2n_i+1)}(t) \not\equiv 0$ mod p, $\quad i = 1, \dots, r_A$, and because the Vandermonde determinant $\Delta = |u_{jf^2(2n_i+1)}|_{1 \leq i,j \leq r_A}$ verifies $\Delta \not\equiv 0$ mod p: indeed the foundation theorem 9.1 p.89, its reciprocal 9.2 p92, the theorems 9.6 p.98, 9.8 p.103 and the corollary 9.9 p.105 can be applied here starting from relation (110) p.117, which can be applied for $m = 1, \dots, \frac{p-3}{2}$. As in corollary 9.9 p.105, we have $\phi_{f(2n+1)}(t) \equiv 0$ mod p else $S_{f(2n+1)} \equiv 0$ mod p, the two congruences being simultaneously impossible, because r_A is the minimal natural integer verifying relation (110). This leads to relation (111) p.118. □

Corollary 11.4. **** Let $f, g \in \mathbb{N}$ with $f \times g = p-1, \quad Gcd(f,g) = d > 1$ and f odd. If there exists $n \in \mathbb{N}, \quad n \leq \frac{g-2d}{2d}$ with $\phi_{f(2n+1)}(t) \equiv 0$ mod p then*

$$\phi_{f(2n+1+jg/d)}(t) \equiv 0 \textit{ mod } p, \quad j = 0, \dots, d-1. \tag{112}$$

Proof. Observe the periodicity

$$S_{f(2n+1+jg/d)} \equiv \sum_{k=0}^{r_A} u_{kf^2(2n+1+jg/d)} \equiv \sum_{k=0}^{r_A} u_{kf^2(2n+1)} \equiv S_{f(2n+1)} \text{ mod } p$$

and apply theorem 11.3 p. 118. □

Corollary 11.5. *Let $f, g \in \mathbb{N}$ with $f \times g = p-1, \quad Gcd(f,g) = d > 1$ and f odd. Then*

else

$$B_{p-f(2n+1)} \equiv 0 \textit{ mod } p, \quad n = 0, \dots, \frac{g-2d}{2d},$$

where $B_{p-f(2n+1)}$ are even Bernoulli Numbers.

else *there exists at least one $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\quad 0 \leq n \leq \frac{g-2d}{2}$ such that*

$$\phi_{f(2n+1+jg/d)}(t) \equiv 0 \textit{ mod } p, \quad j = 0, \dots, d-1.$$

Proof. If $\phi_{f(2n+1)}(t) \not\equiv 0 \bmod p$ for $n = 0, \dots, \frac{g-2d}{2d}$ then, from Mirimanoff congruences we derive that $B_{p-f(2n+1)} \equiv 0 \bmod p$, $\quad n = 0, \dots, \frac{g-2d}{2d}$. If there exists one n, $\quad 0 \leq n \leq \frac{g-2d}{2d}$ with $\phi_{f(2n+1)}(t) \equiv 0 \bmod p$ apply corollary 11.4 p. 119. $\square$

11.2 FLT results in intermediate fields $\mathbb{Q} \subset K \subset \mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$.

Let, as previously, denote u a primitive root $\bmod p$. Let $\sigma : \mathbb{Q}(\zeta) \to \mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$ be the $\mathbb{Q}$-isomorphism defined by $\sigma : \zeta \to \zeta^u$. Let $g \in \mathbb{N}$, $\quad g > 2$, $\quad g$ dividing $p-1$. Let K be the intermediate field, $\mathbb{Q} \subset K \subset \mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$, $\quad [K : \mathbb{Q}] = g$. We suppose, in this subsection that p does not divides $h(K/\mathbb{Q})$, class number of the extension $K/\mathbb{Q}$. Let $\mathbf{s}$ be the integral ideal of $\mathbb{Z}[\zeta]$ with $(x+\zeta y)\mathbb{Z}[\zeta] = \mathbf{s}^p$. Let $C = \prod_{i=0}^{(p-1)/g-1} \sigma^{gi}(\mathbf{s})$. We have $C = c\mathbb{Z}[\zeta]$, where c is an integral ideal of $K/\mathbb{Q}$. Then,

$$\prod_{i=0}^{(p-1)g-1} (x + \zeta^{u_{gi}} y)\mathbb{Z}[\zeta] = \prod_{i=0}^{(p-1)/g-1} \sigma^{gi}(\mathbf{s}^p) = c^p\mathbb{Z}[\zeta].$$

From hypothesis, p does not divide $h(K/\mathbb{Q})$, and so we get

$$\begin{gathered} \prod_{i=0}^{(p-1)/g-1} (x + \zeta^{u_{gi}} y) = \eta\zeta^v\gamma^p, \\ \gamma \in \mathbb{Z}[\zeta], \quad \eta \in \mathbb{Z}[\zeta+\zeta^{-1}]^*, \quad v \in \mathbb{Z}, \quad 0 \leq v \leq p-1. \end{gathered} \tag{113}$$

We shall apply this results when 3 divides $p-1$ and $g = \frac{p-1}{3}$.

Theorem 11.6. *Suppose that 3 divides $p-1$. Let K be the field $\mathbb{Q} \subset K \subset \mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$ with $[K : \mathbb{Q}] = \frac{p-1}{3}$. If p does not divide $h(K/\mathbb{Q})$, class number of the extension $K/\mathbb{Q}$, then the first case of FLT holds for p.*

Proof. Let $g = \frac{p-1}{3}$. From equation (113) p.120, we get, similarly to proof of theorem 9.1 p.89, for $m \geq 1$,

$$\phi_{2m+1}(t) \times \sum_{i=0}^{(p-1)/g-1} u_{gi}^{2m+1} \equiv 0 \bmod p.$$

Then, for $m = 1$, we obtain

$$\phi_3(t) \times \sum_{i=0}^{2} u^{3gi} \equiv 0 \bmod p.$$

But $3g = p-1$ and so $u^{3gi} \equiv 1 \bmod p$. Then, we should have $3 \times \phi_3(t) \equiv 0 \bmod p$, which is not possible, because $\phi_3(t) \not\equiv 0 \bmod p$: in fact $\phi_3(t) \equiv 0 \Longrightarrow P_3(-t) \equiv 0 \bmod p$, where $P_3(-t) = -t(1+t)$ is a Kummer Polynomial, see for instance [39], 4D p 125; but $(1+t) = \frac{y-x}{y} \not\equiv 0 \bmod p$ because we assume in this article that $p > 5$ and therefore that $y - x \not\equiv 0 \bmod p$. ☐

Remark: In comparison, when $g = \frac{p-1}{2}$, Vandiver's conjecture asserts that $h(K/\mathbb{Q}) = h(\mathbb{Q}(\zeta+\zeta^{-1})/\mathbb{Q}) \not\equiv 0 \bmod p$ and there was several failed tentatives of proof of first case of FLT assuming Vandiver's conjecture.

11.3 Fermat equation in quadratic subfield of $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)/\mathbb{Q}$.

Let us define $\delta_p \in \{-1, 1\}$ by $\delta_p = 1$ if $p \equiv 1 \bmod 4$ and $\delta_p = -1$ if $p \equiv 3 \bmod 4$. Then the quadratic field $\mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{\delta_p p}) \subset \mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$.

Lemma 11.7. *For $1 \le j < \frac{p-1}{2}$, we have $P = \prod_{j=0}^{(p-3)/2} \sigma_2^j(\mathbf{s}) = Q\mathbb{Z}[\zeta]$, where Q is a principal integral ideal of the quadratic field $\mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{\delta_p p})$.*

Proof. Note that $\sigma_2^{(p-1)/2} : \zeta \to \zeta^{u_2^{(p-1)/2}}$ is the identity map. Note that $\sigma_2 \circ \sigma_2^j = \sigma_2^{j+1}$. Compute $S = \sigma_2(\prod_{j=0}^{(p-3)/2} \sigma_2^j(\mathbf{s}))$ where we recall that $(x + \zeta y)\mathbb{Z}[\zeta] = \mathbf{s}^p$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} & S = \prod_{j=0}^{(p-3)/2} \sigma_2^{j+1}(\mathbf{s}) \\ & \Longrightarrow \\ & S = (\prod_{j=1}^{(p-3)/2} \sigma_2^j(\mathbf{s})) \times \sigma_2^{(p-1)/2}(\mathbf{s}) \\ & \Longrightarrow \\ & S = (\prod_{j=1}^{(p-3)/2} \sigma_2^j(\mathbf{s})) \times \mathbf{s}, \\ & \Longrightarrow \\ & S = P. \end{aligned} \tag{114}$$

Therefore, from $\sigma_2(P) = P$, there exists an integral ideal Q of $\mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{\delta_p p})$ such that $P = Q\mathbb{Z}[\xi]$. The order of the class of the ideal P of $\mathbb{Z}[\xi]$ is 1 or p. Then, the order of the ideal class of Q in $\mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{\delta_p p})$ is 1 or p. From classical upper bound of the class number of the quadratic number fields, the ideal Q is principal in $\mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{\delta_p p})$. ☐

Lemma 11.8. *Let* $p \equiv 3$ *mod* 4*. Let* A *be the ring of integers of* $\mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{-p})$*. Then the Fermat equation in* A *implies*

$$\prod_{i=0}^{(p-3)/2} (x + \zeta^{u_{2i}} y) = \gamma^p, \quad \gamma \in A. \tag{115}$$

Proof. We have $\prod_{i=0}^{(p-3)/2}(x + \zeta^{u_{2i}} y) \in A$. From lemma (11.7) we get

$$\prod_{i=0}^{(p-3)/2} (x + \zeta^{u_{2i}} y) = \varepsilon \times \gamma^p, \quad \varepsilon \in \mathbb{Z}[\zeta]^*, \quad \gamma \in A.$$

Therefore $\varepsilon \in A^*$. We have $\mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{-p}) \subset \mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$. Then the result is an immediate consequence of the structure of units group of imaginary quadratic extension of $\mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{-p})$ with $I \notin A$. ☐

Lemma 11.9. *Let* $p \equiv 1$ *mod* 4*. Then*

$$\prod_{i=0}^{(p-3)/2} (x + \zeta^{u_{2i}} y) = \varepsilon \times \gamma^p, \quad \gamma \in A, \quad \varepsilon \in A^*. \tag{116}$$

Proof. Here A^* is generated by a fundamental unit $\frac{\varepsilon_0 + \sqrt{p}\varepsilon_1}{2}$. ☐

12 FLT first case: Elementary congruences on $t \equiv -\frac{x}{y}$ mod p.

Let $t \equiv -\frac{x}{y}$ mod p. The definitions of section (8.2) with $f = min((e_p+2), \frac{p-1}{2})$, the sets $I_f = \{g_i \quad | \quad i = 1, \dots, f\}$ and with the sets $L(I_f) = \{l_i \quad | \quad i = 1, \dots, f\}$ used in proposition (2) are available in this section.

- The two first subsections gives a system of polynomial congruences of t: we conjecture that this system of congruences is strong and contains a proof of first case of FLT. We prove also that order a of t mod p, the smaller $a \in \mathbb{N}, \quad a > 1, \quad t^a \equiv 1 \bmod p$, verifies $a > e_p + 2$. The two subsections gives two method of proof of these congruences.
- In the third subsection, we prove, from symmetries on Mirimanoff congruences, that $\phi_{p-1}(t^2) \equiv 0 \bmod p$, and we derive a proof of this particular case of Fermat-Wiles theorem : if $p \| (x-y)(y-z)(z-x), \quad x, y, z \in \mathbb{N} - \{0\}$, then $x^p + y^p + z^p \neq 0$.
- In the fourth subsection, we obtain a set of $p-1$ explicit congruences $P_m(t) \equiv 0 \bmod p, \quad P_m(T) \in \mathbf{F}_p[T], \quad m = 1, \dots, p-1$ and also as a consequence $\phi_{p-2}(t^2) \equiv 0 \bmod p$.

12.1 A First elementary approach

Theorem 12.1. **** Let $t \in \mathbb{N}, \quad t \equiv -\frac{y}{x}$ mod p. Let* **any** *set $I_f = \{g_i \mid i = 1, \dots, f,$ and $L(I_f)$. Let us, for $i = 1, \dots, f, \quad k = 1, \dots, p-1$, define $m_{ik} \in \mathbb{N}$ by the congruence*

$$g_i \times m_{ik} \equiv k \ mod\ p, \quad 1 \leq m_{ik} \leq p-1. \tag{117}$$

Then, we have the $p-2$ congruences:

$$\sum_{i=1}^{f} (l_i g_i) \times \{(t^{m_{ik}} + t^{p-m_{ik}}) - (t^{m_{i1}} + t^{p-m_{i1}})\} \equiv 0 \ mod\ p, \quad k = 2, \dots p-1. \tag{118}$$

Reciprocally, if

$$\sum_{i=1}^{f} (l_i g_i) \times \{(t^{m_{ik}} + t^{p-m_{ik}}) - (t^{m_{i1}} + t^{p-m_{i_1}})\} \equiv 0 \ mod\ p, \quad k = 2, \dots p-1.$$

then

$$\sum_{i=1}^{f} \frac{g_i l_i}{(x+\zeta^{g_i} y)} + \sum_{i=1}^{f} \frac{g_i l_i}{(x+\zeta^{g_i} y)} \equiv 0 \ \mathit{mod}\ p$$

Proof. From proof of theorem 9.1 p.89 the relation

$$\sum_{i=1}^{f} \frac{g_i l_i}{(x+\zeta^{g_i} y)} + \sum_{i=1}^{f} \frac{g_i l_i}{(x+\zeta^{g_i} y)} \equiv 0 \bmod p$$

is equivalent to the relation (83) p.90

(119)

$F(\zeta) =$

$$\sum_{i=1}^{f} g_i l_i \times (x^{p-1} - \zeta^{g_i} x^{p-2} y + \zeta^{2g_i} x^{p-3} y^2 - \dots - \zeta^{(p-2)g_i} x y^{p-2} + \zeta^{(p-1)g_i} y^{p-1})$$

$$+ \sum_{i=1}^{f} g_i l_i \times (x^{p-1} - \zeta^{-g_i} x^{p-2} y + \zeta^{-2g_i} x^{p-3} y^2 - \dots - \zeta^{-(p-2)g_i} x y^{p-2} + \zeta^{-(p-1)g_i} y^{p-1})$$

$\equiv 0 \bmod \pi^{p-1}$.

Compute the coefficient α_k of ζ^k in expression of $F(\zeta)$; there exists one $\alpha_k \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that we have, for all k, $\quad 1 \leq k \leq p-1$:

(120)

$$\sum_{i=1, g_i m_{ik} \equiv k \bmod p}^{i=f} (l_i g_i) \times ((-1)^{m_{ik}} (\frac{y}{x})^{m_{ik}})$$

$$+ \sum_{i=1, (-g_i) m'_{ik} \equiv k \bmod p}^{i=f} (l_i g_i) \times ((-1)^{m'_{ik}} (\frac{y}{x})^{m'_{ik}}) \equiv \alpha_k \bmod p,$$

$$\Longleftrightarrow$$

$$\sum_{i=1, g_i m_{ik} \equiv k \bmod p}^{i=f} (l_i g_i) \times t^{m_{ik}} + \sum_{i=1, (-g_i) m'_{ik} \equiv k \bmod p}^{i=f} (l_i g_i) \times t^{m'_{ik}} \equiv \alpha_k \bmod p,$$

$$\Longleftrightarrow$$

$$\sum_{i=1, g_i m_{ik} \equiv k \bmod p}^{i=f} (l_i g_i) \times t^{m_{ik}} + \sum_{i=1, g_i m_{ik} \equiv k \bmod p}^{i=f} (l_i g_i) \times t^{p-m_{ik}} \equiv \alpha_k \bmod p,$$

$$\Longleftrightarrow$$

$$S_k = \sum_{i=1, g_i m_{ik} \equiv k \bmod p}^{i=f} (l_i g_i) \times (t^{m_{ik}} + t^{p-m_{ik}}) \equiv \alpha_k \bmod p, \quad k = 1, \dots, p-1.$$

From relation 119 p. 124, we derive that $S_k - S_1 \equiv 0 \bmod p$. then we obtain the result, computing $S_k - S_1$.

□

Theorem 12.2. *****

Let f be an integer with $p-2 \geq f \geq min(e_p + 2, \frac{p-1}{2})$.

Let E_f be **any** *set*

$E_f = \{g_i \in \mathbb{N} \quad | \quad i = 1, \dots, f, \quad 1 \leq g_i \leq p-1\}$.

Let K_f be **any** *set*

$K_f = \{k_j \in \mathbb{N} \quad | \quad j = 1, \dots, f, \quad 1 \leq k_j \leq p-1\}$.

Let us note, for $i = 1, \dots f, \quad j = 1, \dots, f$,

$$m_{ij} \equiv g_i^{-1} \times k_j \ mod\ p, \quad 1 \leq m_{ij} \leq p-1,$$
$$\theta_{ij} = (t^{m_{ij}} + t^{p-m_{ij}}) - (t^{m_{i1}} + t^{p-m_{i1}}).$$

If the first case of FLT would fail for p then *the determinant*

$$\Delta_f(t) = \begin{vmatrix} \theta_{11} & \dots & \theta_{i1} & \dots & \theta_{f1} \\ \vdots & & \vdots & & \vdots \\ \theta_{1j} & \dots & \theta_{ij} & \dots & \theta_{fj} \\ \vdots & & \vdots & & \vdots \\ \theta_{1f} & \dots & \theta_{if} & \dots & \theta_{ff} \end{vmatrix} \equiv 0 \ mod \ p.$$

Proof.

- Note, at first, that if $g_{i_1} = g_{i_2}$ for some $1 \le i_1 \le i_2 \le p-1$, then $m_{i_1 j} = m_{i_2 j}$ for $j = 1, \dots, f$ and $\Delta_f(t) = 0$ because it has two identical columns. In the same way, if $k_{j_1} = k_{j_2}$ for some $1 \le j_1 \le j_2 \le p-1$, then $m_{ij_1} = m_{ij_2}$ for $i = 1, \dots, f$ and $\Delta_f(t) = 0$ because it has two identical rows.

- Suppose then that

  $$E_f = \{g_i \in \mathbb{N}, \quad i = 1, \dots, f, \quad 1 \le g_i \le p-1, \quad i \neq i' \Longrightarrow g_i \neq g_{i'}\}.$$
  $$K_f = \{k_j \in \mathbb{N}, \quad j = 1, \dots, f, \quad 1 \le k_j \le p-1, \quad j \neq j' \Longrightarrow k_j \neq k_{j'}\}.$$

  It is then an immediate consequence of the system of f first congruences of the previous proposition 12.1 p.123 on the f indeterminates $X_i = l_i g_i \bmod p, \quad i = 1, \dots, f$ with $I_f = E_f$.

□

12.2 A second elementary approach

Theorem 12.3. **** Let $t \in \mathbb{N}, \quad t \equiv -\frac{y}{x} \ mod \ p$. Let* **any** *set I_f and $L(I_f)$. Let us, for $i = 1, \dots, f, \quad k = 1, \dots, p-1$, define $m_{ik} \in \mathbb{N}$ by the congruence*

$$g_i \times m_{ik} \equiv k \ mod \ p, \quad 1 \le m_{ik} \le p-1. \tag{121}$$

Then, we have the $p-1$ congruences:

$$\sum_{i=1}^{f} (l_i g_i) \times (t^{m_{ik}} + t^{p-m_{ik}}) \equiv 0 \ mod \ p, \quad k = 1, \dots p-1. \tag{122}$$

Reciprocally, if

$$\sum_{i=1}^{f} (l_i g_i) \times (t^{m_{ik}} + t^{p-m_{ik}}) \equiv 0 \ mod \ p, \quad k = 1, \dots p-1.$$

then

$$\sum_{i=1}^{f}\frac{g_il_i}{(x+\zeta^{g_i}y)}+\sum_{i=1}^{f}\frac{g_il_i}{(x+\zeta^{g_i}y)}\equiv 0 \ mod\ p$$

Proof. Let us consider, for the indeterminate X, the rational function $F(X)\in\mathbb{Q}(X)$ defined in relation (83) p.90 and (90) p.92.

$$F(X)=\sum_{i=1}^{f}g_il_i\times(\sum_{m=0}^{p-1}(-1)^m x^{p-1-m}y^mX^{mg_i}+\sum_{m=0}^{p-1}(-1)^m x^{p-1-m}y^mX^{-mg_i})$$

From theorem (**??**) p.**??** we get $F(1)\equiv F'_X(1)\equiv F^{(2)}_X(1)\equiv\dots\equiv F^{(p-1)}\equiv 0 \bmod p$. Considering congruences $\bmod p$ we can use the lighter notation

$$F(X)=\sum_{i=1}^{f}g_il_i\times(\sum_{m=0}^{p-1}(-1)^m(-t)^mX^{mg_i}+\sum_{m=0}^{p-1}(-1)^m(-t)^mX^{-mg_i})$$

and so

$$F(X)=\sum_{i=1}^{f}g_il_i\times(\sum_{m=0}^{p-1}t^mX^{mg_i}+\sum_{m=0}^{p-1}t^mX^{-mg_i})$$

We compute $F^{(p-1)}_X(X)$. We have

$$(X^{mg_i})^{(p-1)}_X=mg_i\times(mg_i-1)\times\dots(mg_i-(p-2))\times X^{mg_i-(p-1)}=a_i\times X^{mg_i-(p-1)}.$$

If $a_i\not\equiv 0 \bmod p$ then $mg_i-(p-1)\equiv 0 \bmod p$ and, from Wilson theorem, $a_i\equiv -1 \bmod p$. Then,

$$(X^{mg_i})^{(p-1)}_{X=1}=-g_il_i,\quad mg_i\equiv p-1 \bmod p.$$

In the same way, we find that

$$(X^{-mg_i})^{(p-1)}_{X=1}=-g_il_i,\quad mg_i\equiv 1 \bmod p.$$

and finally, from $F^{(p-1)}_X(1)\equiv 0 \bmod p$, that

$$\sum_{i=1,\quad m_ig_i\equiv 1 \bmod p}^{f}g_il_i\times(t^{m_i}+t^{(p-m_i)})\equiv 0 \bmod p.$$

The same computation for $F^{(p-2)}(X)$ leads to the congruence

$$\begin{aligned}&\sum_{i=1,\quad m_{i,2}\times g_i\equiv 2 \bmod p}^{f} g_i l_i \times (t^{m_{i,2}}+t^{p-m_{i,2}})\\ &-(\sum_{i=1,\quad m_{i,1}\times g_i\equiv 1 \bmod p}^{f} g_i l_i \times (t^{m_{i,1}}+t^{p-m_{i,1}}))\times\zeta \equiv 0 \bmod p,\end{aligned}$$

so

$$\sum_{i=1,\quad m_{i,2}\times g_i\equiv 2 \bmod p}^{f} g_i l_i \times (t^{m_{i,2}}+t^{p-m_{i,2}}) \equiv 0 \bmod p,$$

and so on. The proof of reciprocal result is similar to theorem 12.1 p.123. □

Theorem 12.4. *****
Let f be an integer with $f \geq min(e_p+2, \frac{p-1}{2})$.
Let E_f be **any** *set*
$E_f = \{g_i \in \mathbb{N},\quad i=1,\dots,f,\quad 1 \leq g_i \leq p-1\}$.
Let K_f be **any** *set*
$K_f = \{k_j \in \mathbb{N},\quad j=1,\dots,f,\quad 1 \leq k_j \leq p-1\}$.
Let us define for $i=1,\dots f,\quad j=1,\dots,f$

$$\begin{aligned}&m_{ij} \equiv g_i^{-1}\times k_j \ mod\ p,\quad 1 \leq m_{ij} \leq p-1,\\ &g_i \in E_f,\quad k_j \in K_f,\\ &\theta_{ij} = (t^{m_{ij}} + t^{p-m_{ij}} \ mod\ p).\end{aligned}$$

If the first case of FLT would fail for p then the determinant

$$\Delta_f(t) = \begin{vmatrix} \theta_{11} & \dots & \theta_{i1} & \dots & \theta_{f1}\\ \vdots & & \vdots & & \vdots\\ \theta_{1j} & \dots & \theta_{ij} & \dots & \theta_{fj}\\ \vdots & & \vdots & & \vdots\\ \theta_{1f} & \dots & \theta_{if} & \dots & \theta_{ff}\end{vmatrix} \equiv 0 \ mod\ p.$$

Proof. Similar to theorem 12.2 p.125 starting of theorem 12.3 p.126. □

Corollary 12.5. *****
Let $t \equiv -\frac{x}{y}$ mod p.
Let f be an integer with $f \geq min(e_p+2, \frac{p-1}{2})$.
Let u be a primitive root mod p.

Let $l \in \mathbb{N}, \quad 1 \leq l \leq p-1.$
Let $m \in \mathbb{N}, \quad 1 \leq l \leq p-1.$
If the first case of FLT would fail for p *then*
the determinant $\Delta_f(t) =$

$$\begin{vmatrix}
t^{u_{m-l}} + t^{p-u_{m-l}} & \dots & t^{u_{m-l\times i}} + t^{p-u_{m-l\times i}} & \dots & t^{u_{m-l\times f}} + t^{p-u_{m-l\times f}} \\
\vdots & & \vdots & & \vdots \\
t^{u_{m\times j-l}} + t^{p-u_{m\times j-l}} & \dots & t^{u_{m\times j-l\times i}} + t^{p-u_{m\times j-l\times i}} & \dots & t^{u_{m\times j-l\times f}} + t^{p-u_{m\times j-l\times f}} \\
\vdots & & \vdots & & \vdots \\
t^{u_{m\times f-l}} + t^{p-u_{m\times f-l}} & \dots & t^{u_{m\times f-l\times i}} + t^{p-u_{m\times f-l\times i}} & \dots & t^{u_{m\times f-l\times f}} + t^{p-u_{m\times f-l\times f}}
\end{vmatrix}$$

verifies the congruence $\Delta_f(t) \equiv 0 \ mod\ p.$

Proof. We apply theorem 12.4 p.128 with the sets $E_f = \{u_{l\times i} \quad | \quad i = 1, \dots, f\}$ and with the set $K_f = \{u_{m\times j} \quad | \quad j = 1, \dots, f\}$. ☐

We give now two examples of application of theorem 12.4 p.128.

Theorem 12.6. *Suppose that* $p \equiv 3 \ mod\ 4$. *Let as usual* u *be a primitive root* $mod\ p$. *Then we get the* $p-1$ *congruences*

$$\sum_{i=1}^{(p-1)/2} u_{2i} \times (t^{m_{i,k}} + t^{p-m_{i,k}}) \equiv 0 \ mod\ p, \tag{123}$$
$$k = 1, \dots, p-1, \quad u_{2i} \times m_{i,k} \equiv k \ mod\ p, \quad 1 \leq m_{i,k} \leq p-1.$$

which gives for $k = 1$,

$$\sum_{i=1}^{(p-1)/2} u_{2i} \times (t^{u_{-2i}} + t^{p-u_{-2i}}) \equiv 0 \ mod\ p, \tag{124}$$

Proof. Apply theorem 12.3 p.126. ☐

Theorem 12.7. **** On order of* t *mod* p

Let $a \in \mathbb{N}$ *be the order of* t *mod* p *(the smaller integer different of* 0 *such that* $t^a \equiv 1 \ mod\ p$*). Then, if first case of FLT fails for* p, $a > \frac{p-1}{e_p+2}$.

Proof. Suppose that $a \leq \frac{p-1}{e_p+2}$ and search for a contradiction: It is always possible to choose $f = e_p + 2$ and $g_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, f-1$ such that

$$g_i \equiv i^{-1} a^{-1} \bmod p, \quad i = 1, \dots, f-1,$$
$$k_1 = 1.$$

Then, we have, from hypothesis on a applied to theorem 12.3 p.126,

$$\begin{aligned}&m_{i1} = i \times a, \quad i = 1, \dots, f-1,\\ &0 < m_{i1} < p,\\ &t^{m_{i1}} = t^{i\times a} \equiv 1 \text{ mod } p.\end{aligned}$$

It is also possible to choose g_f and $g_f \times m_{f1} \equiv 1 \text{ mod } p$, so such that $t^{m_{f1}} + t^{p-m_{f1}} \not\equiv 1 + t \text{ mod } p$; then, from theorem 12.3 p.126, we get

$$\sum_{i=1}^{f} l_i g_i \times (1+t) + l_f g_f \times (t^{m_{f1}} + t^{p-m_{f1}}) \equiv 0 \text{ mod } p.$$

But, from lemma 8.7 p.84, we have $\sum_{i=1}^{f} l_i g_i \equiv 0 \text{ mod } p$ which would lead to $t^{m_{f1}} + t^{p-m_{f1}} \equiv 1 + t \text{ mod } p$, contradiction. □

12.3 A partial proof of FLT first case with symmetric sums of Mirimanoff polynomials

Recall some results seen previously

- Let $x, y, z \in \mathbb{Z} - \{0\}$ verifying Fermat's equation $x^p + y^p + z^p = 0$. Let, without loss of generality, $t = -\frac{x}{y} \text{ mod } p, \quad t \in \mathbb{N}, \quad 1 < t \leq p-1$.
- Let T be an indeterminate. Let $\phi_m(T), \quad m = 1, \dots, p-1$, be the Mirimanoff polynomials:

$$\phi_m(T) = \sum_{m=1}^{p-1} i^{m-1} \times T^i. \tag{125}$$

- The Mirimanoff's congruences used here are

$$\phi_m(t) \times \phi_{p-m}(t) \equiv 0 \text{ mod } p, \quad m = 1, \dots, p-1.$$

- Let us define $S(T) = \sum_{m=1}^{p-1} \phi_m(T) \times \phi_{p-m}(T)$.

Lemma 12.8.

$$S(T) \equiv -\phi_{p-1}(T^2) \textit{ mod } p.$$

Proof. From previous definitions, we get

$$S(T) = \sum_{m=1}^{p-1} (\sum_{i=1}^{p-1} i^{m-1} \times T^i) \times (\sum_{j=1}^{p-1} j^{p-m-1} \times T^j).$$

With a reordering of finite sums, we get

$$S(T) = \sum_{m=1}^{p-1}\sum_{i=1}^{p-1}\sum_{j=1}^{p-1} i^{m-1} \times j^{p-m-1} \times T^{i+j}.$$

We collect the terms with $i = j$ to obtain

$$S(T) = \sum_{m=1}^{p-1}\sum_{i=1}^{p-1}\sum_{j=1,\quad j\neq i}^{p-1} i^{m-1} \times j^{p-m-1} \times T^{i+j} + \sum_{m=1}^{p-1}\sum_{i=1}^{p-1} i^{m-1} \times i^{p-m-1} \times T^{2i}.$$

But

$$\sum_{m=1}^{p-1}\sum_{i=1}^{p-1}\sum_{j=1,\quad j\neq i}^{p-1} i^{m-1} \times j^{p-m-1} \times T^{i+j} =$$
$$\sum_{i=1}^{p-1}\sum_{j=1,\quad j\neq i}^{p-1}\sum_{m=1}^{p-1} i^{m-1} \times j^{p-m-1} \times T^{i+j}.$$

But, from $i \neq j$,

$$\sum_{m=1}^{p-1} i^{m-1} \times j^{p-m-1} \times T^{i+j} = j^{p-2} \times (\sum_{m=1}^{p-1} i^{m-1} \times j^{-(m-1)}) \times T^{i+j} =$$
$$\sum_{m=1}^{p-1} i^{m-1} \times j^{p-m-1} \times T^{i+j} = j^{p-2} \times (\frac{i^{p-1} \times j^{-(p-1)} - 1}{i \times j^{-1} - 1}) \times T^{i+j} \equiv 0 \bmod p.$$

Therefore, we get

$$S(T) \equiv \sum_{m=1}^{p-1}\sum_{i=1}^{p-1} i^{m-1} \times i^{p-m-1} \times T^{2i} \bmod p,$$

also

$$S(T) \equiv \sum_{m=1}^{p-1}\sum_{i=1}^{p-1} i^{p-2} \times T^{2i} \bmod p,$$

and finally

$$S(T) \equiv (p-1) \times \phi_{p-1}(T^2),$$

which achieves the proof. □

Lemma 12.9. *Let* $S_2(T) = \sum_{n=1}^{(p-1)/2} \phi_{2n}(T) \times \phi_{p-2n}(T)$. *Then*

$$S_2(T) \equiv \frac{p-1}{2} \times \phi_{p-1}(T^2) \ mod\ p.$$

Proof. From previous definitions, we get

$$S_2(T) = \sum_{n=1}^{(p-1)/2} (\sum_{i=1}^{p-1} i^{2n-1} \times T^i) \times (\sum_{j=1}^{p-1} j^{p-2n-1} \times T^j).$$

With a reordering of finite sums, we get

$$S_2(T) = \sum_{n=1}^{(p-1)/2} \sum_{i=1}^{p-1} \sum_{j=1}^{p-1} i^{2n-1} \times j^{p-2n-1} \times T^{i+j}.$$

We collect the terms with $i^2 = j^2$ to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} S_2(T) = & \sum_{n=1}^{(p-1)/2} \sum_{i=1}^{p-1} \sum_{j=1,\quad j^2 \not\equiv i^2 (p)}^{p-1} i^{2n-1} \times j^{p-2n-1} \times T^{i+j} \\ + & \sum_{n=1}^{(p-1)/2} \sum_{i=1}^{p-1} i^{2n-1} \times i^{p-2n-1} \times T^{2i} \\ + & \sum_{n=1}^{(p-1)/2} \sum_{i=1}^{p-1} i^{2n-1} \times (-i)^{p-2n-1} \times T^{p}. \end{aligned}$$

But

$$\sum_{n=1}^{(p-1)/2} \sum_{i=1}^{p-1} \sum_{j=1,\quad j^2 \neq i^2}^{p-1} i^{2n-1} \times j^{p-2n-1} \times T^{i+j} =$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^{p-1} \sum_{j=1,\quad j^2 \neq i^2}^{p-1} \sum_{n=1}^{(p-1)/2} i^{2n-1} \times j^{p-2n-1} \times T^{i+j}.$$

But, from $i^2 \not\equiv j^2 \bmod p$,

$$\sum_{n=1}^{(p-1)/2} i^{2n-1} \times j^{p-2n-1} \times T^{i+j} = j^{p-2} \times (\sum_{n=1}^{(p-1)/2} i^{2n-1} \times j^{-(2n-1)}) \times T^{i+j}.$$

We have, from $i^2 \not\equiv j^2 \bmod p$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{n=1}^{(p-1)/2} i^{2n-1} j^{-(2n-1)} + \sum_{n=1}^{(p-1)/2} i^{2n} j^{-2n} \equiv 0 \bmod p, \\ & \sum_{n=1}^{(p-1)/2} i^{2n} j^{-2n} \equiv 0 \bmod p, \end{aligned}$$

Therefore $\sum_{n=1}^{(p-1)/2} i^{2n-1} j^{-(2n-1)} \equiv 0 \bmod p$, so for $i^2 \not\equiv 0 \bmod p$,

$$\sum_{n=1}^{(p-1)/2} i^{2n-1} \times j^{p-2n-1} \times T^{i+j} \equiv 0 \bmod p.$$

Therefore, we get

$$S_2(T) \equiv \sum_{n=1}^{(p-1)/2} \sum_{i=1}^{p-1} i^{p-2} \times T^{2i} + \sum_{n=1}^{(p-1)/2} \sum_{i=1}^{p-1} i^{p-2} T^p \bmod p,$$

also

$$S_2(T) \equiv \sum_{n=1}^{(p-1)/2} \sum_{i=1}^{p-1} i^{p-2} \times T^{2i} \bmod p,$$

and finally

$$S_2(T) \equiv \frac{p-1}{2} \times \phi_{p-1}(T^2),$$

which achieves the proof. $\square$

Lemma 12.10. *Let $x^p + y^p + z^p = 0, \quad x \times y \times z \not\equiv 0$ mod p, be the Fermat equation, first case.*

1. *$\phi_{p-1}(-t) \equiv \phi_{p-1}(t) \equiv \phi_{p-1}(t^2) \equiv 0$ mod p.*
2. *If $x \equiv y$ mod p then $x \equiv y$ mod p^2.*
3. *If $x \not\equiv y$ mod p then $(x-y)^{p-1} \equiv 1$ mod p^2.*

Proof. From lemma 12.9 p. 131 and from Mirimanoff congruences 125 p. 130, we derive that $\phi_{p-1}(t^2) \equiv 0 \bmod p$. From Ribenboim [39] relation (1.23) p 144, we get

$$\phi_{p-1}(t^2) \equiv \frac{1 - t^{2p} - (1-t^2)^p}{p} \equiv 0 \bmod p,$$

so

$$1 - t^{2p} - (1-t^2)^p \equiv 0 \bmod p^2,$$

and so

$$(1-t^p) \times (1+t^p) - (1-t)^p \times (1+t)^p \equiv 0 \bmod p^2.$$

From Ribenboim [39] p 145 we get $\phi_{p-1}(t) \equiv 0 \bmod p$, so

$$\frac{1 - t^p - (1-t)^p}{p} \equiv 0 \bmod p,$$

so

$$1 - t^p - (1-t)^p \equiv 0 \bmod p^2.$$

From these relations, we get

$$1 + t^p - (1+t)^p \equiv 0 \bmod p^2,$$

because $1 - t = \frac{x+y}{y} \not\equiv 0 \bmod p$. Thus

$$\frac{(1+t^p) - (1+t)^p}{p} \equiv \phi_{p-1}(-t) \equiv 0 \bmod p.$$

Also

$$1 - (\frac{x}{y})^p - (1 - \frac{x}{y})^p \equiv 0 \bmod p^2,$$

and so

$$y^p - x^p \equiv (y-x)^p \bmod p^2.$$

But, from $x^p \equiv x \bmod p^2$ and $y^p \equiv y \bmod p^2$, classical Fermat result, we get

$$y - x \equiv (y-x)^p \bmod p^2,$$

also

$$(y-x) \times (1 - (y-x)^{p-1}) \equiv 0 \bmod p^2.$$

Therefore $y - x \equiv 0 \bmod p$ implies that $y - x \equiv 0 \bmod p^2$ and $y - x \not\equiv 0 \bmod p$ implies that $(y-x)^{p-1} - 1 \equiv 0 \bmod p^2$, which achieves the proof. □

Remark: observe that the assertion $y - x \not\equiv 0 \bmod p \Rightarrow (y-x)^{p-1} - 1 \equiv 0 \bmod p^2$ can be directly derived of second Futwangler theorem, see for instance Ribenboim, [39] (3C) p. 169.

Theorem 12.11. **** A particular case of Fermat-Wiles*
Let $x, y, z \in \mathbb{Z} - \{0\}$, pairwise coprime. Then $p \| (x-y) \times (y-z) \times (z-x)$ implies that $x^p + y^p + z^p \neq 0$.

Proof.

- Suppose that second case holds and search for a contradiction: If $p \| (x-y)$ then $x \times y \not\equiv 0 \bmod p$, so $p | z$, and also $p | 2x^p \Rightarrow p | x$, which is not possible because $gcd(x, z) = 1$.
- If $x \times y \times z \not\equiv 0 \bmod p$, then the theorem is an immediate consequence of lemma 12.10 p. 133.

□

12.4 Some elementary congruences derived of Mirimanoff's congruences- II

Recall that in exponential congruences, we denote $a^{b(p)}$ and not $a^{b \bmod p}$.

In this subsection, starting from the Mirimanoff's congruences $\phi_m(t)\times\phi_{p-m}(t)\equiv 0 \text{ mod } p,\quad m=1,\dots p-1$, we prove the set of elementary explicit congruences mod p:

Theorem 12.12. *****
$t=-\frac{x}{y}$ mod p verifies the strong set of $p-1$ congruences

$$\sum_{j=1}^{p-1} j^{p-2}\times t^{kj(p)+j}\equiv 0 \ mod\ p,\quad k=1,\dots,p-1.$$

Proof. We have, from Mirimanoff's congruences, see Ribenboim [39] (1B) p 145,

$$\phi_m(t)\times\phi_{p-m}(t)\equiv 0 \text{ mod } p,\quad m=1,\dots,p-1,$$

also, expliciting Mirimanoff's polynomials,

$$(\sum_{i=1}^{p-1} i^{m-1}t^i)\times(\sum_{j=1}^{p-1} j^{p-m-1}t^j)\equiv 0 \text{ mod } p,\quad m=1,\dots,p-1.$$

This relation leads to

$$\sum_{i=1}^{p-1}\sum_{j=1}^{p-1}(ij^{-1})^{m-1}\times j^{-1}\times t^{i+j},\quad m=1,\dots,p-1.$$

Let $ij^{-1}\equiv k \text{ mod } p,\quad 1\le k\le p-1$, so with $i\equiv kj \text{ mod } p$. We get

$$\sum_{k=1}^{p-1} k^{m-1}\{\sum_{j=1}^{p-1} j^{-1}\times t^{kj(p)+j}\}\equiv 0 \text{ mod } p.$$

Let $X_k\in\mathbb{N},\quad X_k\equiv\sum_{k=1}^{p-1} j^{-1}\times t^{kj(p)+j}$ mod p. We obtain the set of $p-1$ linear congruences of the $p-1$ indeterminates $X_k,\quad k=1,\dots,p-1$,

$$\sum_{k=1}^{p-1} k^{m-1}\times X_k\equiv 0 \text{ mod } p,\quad m=1,\dots,p-1.$$

This system has only the trivial solution $X_k=0,\quad k=1,\dots,p-1$, because the Vandermonde determinant

$$|k^{m-1}|_{k=1,\dots,p-1,\quad m=1,\dots,p-1}\not\equiv 0 \text{ mod } p,$$

which achieves the proof. □

Corollary 12.13. $\phi_{p-2}(t^2) \equiv 0$ *mod* p.

Proof. Immediate consequence of theorem 12.12 p. 135. $\square$

Remark: In Numerical MAPLE investigations, we have noticed that, for the indeterminate T,

$$\sum_{j=1}^{p-1} j^{m-1} \times T^{kj \ (p)} \equiv c_{k,m} \times \phi_m(T) \bmod p, \quad m = 1, \dots, p-2, \quad k = 1, \dots, p-1,$$

$c_{k,m} \in \mathbf{F}_p[m, k]$.

For instance

$$\sum_{j=1}^{p-1} j^{p-2} \times T^{kj \ (p)} \equiv (p-k) \times \phi_{p-1}(T) \bmod p, \quad k = 1, \dots, p-1.$$

12.5 Numerical MAPLE applications and a conjecture implying first case of FLT

The theorem 12.4 p.**??** gives $N_f = (C_{p-1}^f)^2$ polynomial exponential congruences $\Delta_f(t) \equiv 0 \bmod p$ where the polynomials $\Delta_f(T) \in \mathbb{Z}[T]$ are explicitly computable on $I_f = \{g_1, \dots, g_f\}$. In our opinion, these congruences are a strong tool for a **full** proof of first case of FLT (try to combine some of them to give a contradiction). We **conjecture** that these congruences are never all simultaneously possible. Towards this direction, let for the prime p, the polynomials $\Delta_l(T) \bmod p, \quad l = 1, \dots, N_f$. We give a verbatim MAPLE list of a program that factorize $Gcd(\Delta_l(T) \bmod p, \quad l = 1, \dots, N_f)$ in the finite field $\mathbf{F}_p[T]$. We have in fact in this example computed the Gcd of a subset of this set of N_f polynomials for $f = [\frac{p}{3}]$, (observe that for a lot of p-cyclotomic fields $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$, and even probably all, we have $e_p < [\frac{p}{3}]$, so it is possible to take $f = [\frac{p}{3}]$. We have defined $\Delta_l(T) \bmod p$ by :

$$\begin{aligned}
&f = [\frac{p}{3}], \\
&l_{max} = [\frac{p}{2}] - f, \\
&g_i = i, \quad i = 1, \dots, f, \\
&k_j = j + l, \quad j = 1, \dots, f, \\
&m_{ij} \equiv g_i^{-1} \times k_j \bmod p.
\end{aligned}$$

The program computes $Gcd(\Delta_l(T) \bmod p, \quad l = 1, \dots, l_{max})$. We have found for $16 < p < 70$, that $Gcd(\Delta_l(T) \bmod p = (T+1) \times (T+p-1)$. We have not pursued because our CPU computer is slow to compute determinants of rank > 70. Nevertheless, the numerical evidence that we observe in these computations lead us to :

Conjecture

$$Gcd(\Delta_l(T)) \bmod p, \quad l = 1, \ldots, N_f) = (T+1) \times (T+p-1).$$

- Observe that in all examples computed for $16 < p < 70$, it was enough to take the gcd of **two** polynomials $\Delta_1(T) \bmod p$ and $\Delta_2(T) \bmod p$, which reinforces strongly our congruence.

- Observe that this conjecture and theorem (12.4) implies First case of FLT, because $(t+1) \times (t+p-1) \not\equiv 0 \bmod p$; it is the same proof than in subsection **??** p.**??**.

```
# This MAPLE program  gives a numerical "obviousness"   that  # theorem 9.4 implies FLT
> #-----------------------
> #  the m_ij g_i k_j theta_ij are those of Theorem 9.4
> # Delta_k(T) mod p, k=1,...,N_f
> restart:
> with(linalg);
> p_inf:=7:
> p_sup:=50:
> p:=p_inf:
> while p < p_sup do
>   p:=nextprime(p):
>   f:=trunc(p/3):
>   lm:=trunc(p/2):
>   print (‘p =‘,p,‘ f = ‘,f,‘ lm = ‘,lm):
>   print(‘----------‘):


>   T_T:=expand((T+1)*(T+p-1)) mod p:
>   r:=array(1..lm):
>   k_j:=array(1..f):
>   g_i:=array(1..f):
>   Delta:=array(1..f,1..f):
>   for i from 1 to f do
>     for j from 1 to f do
>       delta[i,j]:=0:
>     od:
>   od:
```

```
>   #----------------------------------
>   for l from 1 to lm do
>     ind_r_gcd:=0:
>     for i from 1 to f do
>       g_i[i]:=i&^(p-2) mod p:
>     od:
>     for j from 1 to f do
>       k_j[j]:= j+l mod p:
>     od:
>     for i from 1 to f do
>       for j from 1 to f do
>         tem_i:= g_i[i]&^(p-2) mod p:
>         m_ij:= k_j[j]*tem_i mod p:
>         theta_ij:=T^(m_ij)+T^(p-m_ij):
>         Delta[i,j]:=theta_ij:
>       od:
>     od:
>     #-------------------------
>     #print(Delta):
>     v_Delta:=Det(Delta) mod p:
>     v_Delta:=expand(v_Delta) mod p:
>     #print(‘p =‘,p,‘ l =‘,l,‘ v_Delta =‘,v_Delta):
>     #-------------------------
>     if v_Delta = 0 then
>       print(‘p =‘,p,‘ l =‘,l,‘ v_Delta =‘,v_Delta):
>     fi:
>     #----------------------------
>     if v_Delta <> 0 then
>       b_T:=(T^(p-1)-1) mod p :
>       r[l]:=Rem(v_Delta,b_T,T) mod p:
>       r[l]:=expand(r[l]) mod p:
>       r[l]:=Gcd(r[l],b_T) mod p:
>       #--------------------------
>       if l = 1 then
>         r_gcd:= r[1] mod p:
>         print(‘p =‘,p,‘ l = ‘,l,‘ r[1] =‘,Factors(r[l]) mod p):
>         print(‘p =‘,p,‘ l = ‘,l,‘ r_gcd =‘,Factors(r_gcd) mod p):
>       fi:
>       #--------------------------
>       if l > 1 then
>         r_gcd:=Gcd(r_gcd,r[l]) mod p:
>         print(‘p =‘,p,‘ l = ‘,l,‘ r[l] =‘,Factors(r[l]) mod p):
>         print(‘p =‘,p,‘ l = ‘,l,‘ r_gcd =‘,Factors(r_gcd) mod p):
>         if r_gcd = T_T then
>           print(‘ ***** criterion ok **** ‘,\
>           ‘p =‘,p,‘ l = ‘,l,‘ r_gcd = ‘,\
>           Factors(r_gcd) mod p):
>           break:
>         fi:
>       fi:
>     fi:
>     #--------------------------
>   od:
>   if r_gcd <> T_T then
>     print(‘ ***** criterion not ok **** ‘,\
>     ‘p =‘,p, ‘ r_gcd = ‘,\
>     Factors(r_gcd) mod p):
>   fi:
> print(‘#############################‘):
> od:
```

13 FLT first case: Representations of $Gal(\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)/\mathbb{Q})$ approach

We give as applications :

1. A connection between Mirimanoff's polynomials and representations
2. A connection between relative class group C_p^- structure and congruences on Mirimanoff's polynomials
3. A relation between Fermat's congruence p-rank r and p-rank r_1 of the action of G on the ideal $\mathbf{s}$, $\mathbf{s}^p = (x+\zeta y)\mathbb{Z}[\zeta]$.
4. An application of Eichler's theorem in intermediate fields $\mathbb{Q} \subset K \subset \mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$.

The notations and results of previous sections are used in this subsection.

- Recall that the ideal $\mathbf{s}$ is such that $\mathbf{s}^p = (x+\zeta y)\mathbb{Z}[\zeta]$.
- In proposition 2 p.76 , we proved that there exists $L_f = \{l_i \quad | \quad i = 1, \dots, f\}$, such that the ideal $\prod_{i=0}^{f-1} \sigma^i(\mathbf{s})^{l_i}$ is principal.
- We shall translate this result , *mutatis mutandis,* to the principal ideal $\prod_{i=0}^{r_1} \sigma^i(\mathbf{s})^{(-1)^{r_1-i} \times S_{r_1-i}(1)}$ found in relation (10) p.21.
- With the language of representations, the polynomial $P_{r_1}(U) = \prod_{i=1}^{r_1}(U-\mu_i)$ on the indeterminate U is the minimal polynomial such that $P_{r_1}(\sigma)$ annihilates the class of ideal $\mathbf{s}$, also denoted $\mathbf{s}^{P_{r_1}(\sigma)} \simeq \mathbb{Z}[\zeta]$.
- The rank r_1 has two components r_1^- and r_1^+ corresponding to ranks of subgroups of the p-class groups C_p^- and C_p^+ of $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$ with $r_1 = r_1^- + r_1^+$.
- Recall that, for r defined in relation (95) p.95, we have

$$r-1 = Card(\{\phi^*_{2m+1}(t) \not\equiv 0 \bmod p \quad | \quad 0 \le m \le \frac{p-3}{2}\}),$$
$$r-2 = Card(\{\phi_{2m+1}(t) \not\equiv 0 \bmod p \quad | \quad 1 \le m \le \frac{p-3}{2}\}).$$

- $I_\phi = \{2m+1 \quad | \quad 0 \le m \le \frac{p-3}{2}, \quad \phi^*_{2m+1}(t) \not\equiv 0 \bmod p\}$ with $Card(I_\phi) = r-1$.
- $M_{r_1} = \{\mu_i \quad | \quad i = 1, \dots, r_1\}$, with the meaning of μ_i of theorem (2.3)

- With the language of representations, Let $P_r(U)$ be the minimal polynomial of the indeterminate U such that

$$(\frac{x+\zeta y}{x+\zeta^{-1}y})^{P_r(\sigma)} \equiv 1 \text{ mod } \pi^{p+1}, \quad P_r(U)=\prod_{j=1}^{r-1}(U-\mu_j).$$

  equivalent to

$$\prod_{i=0}^{r-1}(\frac{x+\zeta^{u_i}y}{x+\zeta^{-u_i}y})^{n_i} \equiv 1 \text{ mod } \pi^{p+1}, \quad n_0 \not\equiv 0 \text{ mod } p, \quad n_{r-1} \not\equiv 0 \text{ mod } p.$$

13.1 Connection between Mirimanoff's polynomials and representations

Theorem 13.1. *Suppose that first case of FLT fails for p. Then, for each* $2m_j+1 \in I_\phi - 1, \quad j=1,\dots,r-2$, *there exists* $i_j, \quad 1 \le i_j \le r_1$, *with*

$$u_{2m_j+1} = \mu_{i_j}, \tag{126}$$

where $\mu_i, \quad i=1,\dots,r_1$, *are those of representation theorem (2.3).*

Proof.

- From relation (10) p.21 with $d=1$, the ideal $\prod_{i=0}^{r_1}\sigma^i(\mathbf{s})^{(-1)^{r_1-i}\times S_{r_1-i}(1)}$ is a principal ideal; in relation (72) p.77, we considered the principal ideal $\prod_{i=0}^{f-1}\sigma^i(\mathbf{s})^{l_i}$; the relation (72) p. 77 is replaced by the relation (10) p.21, where $\phi_{2m+1}(t) \not\equiv 0 \text{ mod } p$ exactly for the **same** values of $2m+1$ depending only on p and t.

- Then

$$\begin{aligned} &\prod_{i=0}^{r_1}(x+\zeta^{u_i}y)^{(-1)^{r_1-i}\times S_{r_1-i}(1)} = \zeta^v \times \eta \times \gamma^p, \\ &v \in \mathbb{N}, \quad 0 \le v \le p-1, \quad \eta \in \mathbb{Z}[\zeta+\zeta^{-1}]^*, \quad \gamma \in \mathbb{Z}[\zeta]. \end{aligned} \tag{127}$$

  where, by comparison, in relation (72) p.77, we had

$$\prod_{i=0}^{f-1}(x+\zeta^{u_i}y)^{l_i} = \eta_2 \times \gamma^p, \quad \eta_2 \in \mathbb{Z}[\zeta+\zeta^{-1}]^*, \quad \gamma \in \mathbb{Z}[\zeta],$$

  (with here $\zeta^{v_2}=1$).

- Then, from foundation theorem 9.1 p.89 , we obtain the polynomial congruences:

$$\phi_{2m+1}(t) \times \sum_{i=0}^{r_1} (-1)^{r_1-i} \times S_{r_1-i}(1) \times u^{(2m+1)\times i} \equiv 0 \bmod p, \quad m = 1, \dots, \frac{p-3}{2},$$

  and so

$$\sum_{i=0}^{r_1} (-1)^{r_1-i} \times S_{r_1-i}(1) \times u^{(2m_j+1)\times i} \equiv 0 \bmod p, \quad j = 1, \dots, r-2. \tag{128}$$

- The fact that v can be here different of zero had induced to disgard the case $m = 0$ (or $2m + 1 = 1$), corresponding to $\phi^*_{2m+1}(t) = 1$, in theorem 9.1 p.89, so to disgard the congruence corresponding to $m = 0$ involving the sum

$$\sum_{i=0}^{r_1} (-1)^{r_1-i} \times S_{r_1-i}(1) \times u^i \bmod p.$$

- Then the relation (128) p.142 leads algebraically to

$$\prod_{i=1}^{r_1} (u^{2m_j+1} - \mu_i) \equiv 0 \bmod p,$$

  so there exists i_j, $1 \le i_j \le r_1$ such that $u_{2m_j+1} - \mu_{i_j} \equiv 0 \bmod p$, which achieves the proof.

□

Another point of view for a similar result, the representations approach : let us consider the Fermat's minimal multiplicative congruence

$$\prod_{i=0}^{r-1} (\frac{x + \zeta^{u_i} y}{x + \zeta^{-u_i} y})^{n_i} \equiv 1 \bmod \pi^{p+1}.$$

This can be written, in representations notations, with $P_r(\sigma) = \prod_{j=1}^{r-1}(\sigma - \mu_j) \in \mathbf{F}_p[G]$,

$$(\frac{x + \zeta y}{x + \zeta^{-1} y})^{P_r(\sigma)} \equiv 1 \bmod \pi^{p+1}. \tag{129}$$

Lemma 13.2. *Let us note $\rho = r_1^-$. The polynomials $P_\rho(U)$ and $P_r(U)$ of the indeterminate U verify the relation*

$$P_r(U) \mid P_\rho(U) \times (U - u).$$

Proof. The ideal $(\frac{\mathbf{s}}{\overline{\mathbf{s}}})^{P_\rho(\sigma)}$ is principal. In terms of congruences, it induces that

$$(130)\qquad (\frac{x+\zeta y}{x+\zeta^{-1}y})^{P_\rho(\sigma)} \equiv \zeta^{v_1} \bmod \pi^{p+1}, \quad v_1 \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Observe that $U-u$ does not divides $P_\rho(U)$ from lemma 2.7 p.26 derived of Stickelberger theorem; this implies that $v_1 \not\equiv 0 \bmod p$ in this relation. We derive that

$$(131)\qquad (\frac{x+\zeta y}{x+\zeta^{-1}y})^{P_\rho(\sigma)\times(\sigma-u)} \equiv 1 \bmod \pi^{p+1}.$$

From the definition of r and from the relations (129) p.142 and (131) p.143, we get $r-1 \leq \rho+1$. Observe at first that definition of $P_r(U)$ implies that $(U-u) \mid P_r(U)$. Let us make the euclidean division of $P_\rho(U)\times(U-u)$ by $P_r(U)$ in $\mathbf{F}_p[U]$:

$$P_\rho(U)\times(U-u) = P_r(U)\times B(U)+R(U), \quad B(U), R(U) \in \mathbf{F}_p[U], \quad deg(R(U)) < deg(P_r(U)).$$

The remainder $R(U)$ cannot be different of zero : if not, we should have

$$(\frac{x+\zeta y}{x+\zeta^{-1}y})^{R(\sigma)} \equiv 1 \bmod \pi^{p+1},$$

which contradicts the minimality of $P_r(U)$. Therefore $P_r(U)$ divides $P_\rho(U)\times(U-u) = (\prod_{i=1}^{\rho}(U-\mu_i))\times(U-u)$. □

13.2 On rank r of Fermat congruences mod p

Let us note G the Galois group of the field $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$. Recall that the ideal $\mathbf{s}$ is defined by $\mathbf{s}^p = (x+\zeta y)\mathbb{Z}[\zeta]$. We show that, when $h^+ \not\equiv 0 \bmod p$, there is an explicit relation between:

1. the p-rank r of FLT congruences $\bmod \pi^{p+1}$, previously defined in subsection 9.3 p.95,
2. the p-rank r_1 of the $\mathbf{F}_p[G]$ module resulting of G-action on the subgroup $< Cl(\mathbf{s}) >$ of C_p, defined in subsection 2.1 p.15 of this chapter.

This subsection appears to be a **strong** gateway between the $\bmod \pi^{p+1}$ congruences approach of chapters 8 p.76, 9 p.89, and representation approach of this chapter 2 p.15.

Theorem 13.3. **** Let r bet the FLT congruences p-rank defined in relation (95) p.95. Let r_1 be the p-rank of the $\mathbf{F}_p[G]$-module resulting of G-action on the subgroup $< Cl(\mathbf{s}) >$ of C_p, defined in relation (5) p.15. Assume that p does not divide h^+. Then the two rank verify the relation*

$$(132)\qquad r_1 = r-2.$$

Proof. We have shown in relation (95) p.95 that

$$\sum_{i=1}^{r} \frac{u_i l_i}{x+\zeta^{u_i} y} + \sum_{i=1}^{r} \frac{u_i l_i}{x+\zeta^{-u_i} y} \equiv 0 \text{ mod } \pi^{p-1}.$$

We have shown, from lemma 9.5 p.97 that this sum kind of congruence induces a product kind of congruence

$$\prod_{i=1}^{r} (x+\zeta^{u_i} y)^{l_i} - \prod_{i=1}^{r} (x+\zeta^{-u_i} y)^{l_i} \equiv 0 \text{ mod } \pi^{p-1}.$$

This congruence implies the polynomial identity, for the indeterminate X,

$$\prod_{i=1}^{r} (x+X^{u_i} y)^{l_i} - \prod_{i=1}^{r} (x+X^{p-u_i} y)^{l_i} = p \times f(X) + (X^p - 1) \times g(X),$$
$$g(X) \in \mathbb{Z}[X],$$

which annihilates for $X = 1$, and so gives

$$\prod_{i=1}^{r} (x+X^{u_i} y)^{l_i} - \prod_{i=1}^{r} (x+X^{p-u_i} y)^{l_i} = p \times (X-1) \times f_1(X) + (X^p - 1) \times g(X),$$
$$f_1(X) \in \mathbb{Z}[X],$$

and also

$$\prod_{i=1}^{r} (x+\zeta^{u_i} y)^{l_i} - \prod_{i=1}^{r} (x+\zeta^{-u_i} y)^{l_i} = p \times (\zeta - 1) \times f_1(\zeta).$$

Let us denote

$$\varpi = \prod_{i=1}^{r} \frac{(x+\zeta^{u_i} y)^{l_i}}{(x+\zeta^{-u_i} y)^{l_i}}$$

From these relations, we get immediately that

$$\begin{aligned} &\varpi \in \mathbb{Q}(\zeta), \\ &\varpi \equiv 1 \text{ mod } \pi^p, \\ &\overline{\varpi} = \varpi^{-1}. \end{aligned}$$

From Washington, [68], lemma 9.1 p 169, we derive that the extension $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta, \varpi^{1/p})$ is unramified at π and, from [68] exercice 9.1 p 182, that it is unramified at the others primes. Then, from [68] lemma 9.2 p 170, we derive that $\varpi = \beta^p, \quad \beta \in \mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$. Therefore

$$\varpi = \prod_{i=1}^{r} \frac{(x+\zeta^{u_i} y)^{l_i}}{(x+\zeta^{-u_i} y)^{l_i}} = \beta^p, \quad \beta \in \mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$$

and so

$$\prod_{i=1}^{r} \frac{\sigma^{u_i}(\mathbf{s})^{l_i}}{\sigma^{-u_i}(\mathbf{s})^{l_i}} = \beta\mathbb{Z}[\zeta], \quad \beta \in \mathbb{Q}[\zeta]$$

also, we derive of this relation

$$\frac{\prod_{i=1}^{r} \sigma^{u_i}(\mathbf{s})^{2l_i}}{(\prod_{i=1}^{r} \sigma^{u_i}(\mathbf{s})^{l_i}) \times (\prod_{i=1}^{r} \sigma^{-u_i}(\mathbf{s})^{l_i})} = \beta\mathbb{Z}[\zeta],$$

and finally, because $h^+ \not\equiv 0 \bmod p$,

$$\prod_{i=1}^{r} \sigma^{u_i}(\mathbf{s})^{2l_i} = \gamma\mathbb{Z}[\zeta], \quad \gamma \in \mathbb{Z}(\zeta).$$

or

$$\prod_{i=1}^{r} \sigma^{u_i}(\mathbf{s})^{l_i} = \gamma_1\mathbb{Z}[\zeta], \quad \gamma_1 \in \mathbb{Z}(\zeta).$$

Therefore, from definition of r_1, we deduce that $r \geq r_1 + 1$. From relation (101) p.108, we get $r_1 \geq r - 2$, and finally $r - 1 \geq r_1 \geq r - 2$. Then we take the determination $r_1 = r - 2$ because here $r_1 = r_1^-$ and r_1^- is the smaller natural integer such that

$$(\frac{x + \zeta y}{x + \zeta^{-1} y})^{P_{r_1^-}(\sigma)} \equiv \zeta^v \bmod \pi^{p+1}, \quad v \in \mathbb{N},$$

and we have seen that $v \not\equiv 0 \bmod p$: the occurence of this extraneous ζ^v factor leads to chose the determination $r_1 = r - 2$ and not $r_1 = r - 1$. □

Remark: be carefull, the p-rank r_1^- is the dimension of the $\mathbf{F}_p[G]$ module generated by G-action on $< Cl(\mathbf{s}) >$. Thus, the smaller not trivial relation involves $r_1^- + 1$ elements. In an other part, what we call *minimal Fermat's congruence rank* r is the smallest number of elements for a $\bmod \pi^{p-1}$ congruence, and not the greatest r without not trivial congruences $\bmod \pi^p$. Therefore a residual difference of 1 between r_1^- and $r - 1$ is explained by these *terminology conventions* taken in this monograph.

13.3 On Eichler's Theorem in intermediate fields

Theorem 13.4. *Let* $d \in \mathbb{N}$, $\quad p - 1 \equiv 0$ *mod* d, $\quad d < [\sqrt{p}] - 1$. *If first case of FLT would fail for* p *then* $r_d > \frac{[\sqrt{p}]-1}{d}$.

Proof. From relation (9) p.19 we get $r_d \times d \geq r_1$. From Eichler's theorem 8.12 p.87, we get $r_1 > [\sqrt{p}] - 1$. Therefore $r_d \times d \geq [\sqrt{p}] - 1$ which leads to the result. □

14 FLT first case: Representations and congruences $\phi_m(t) \equiv 0 \bmod p$.

We have studied up to now the congruences $\phi_{2m+1}(t) \equiv 0 \bmod p, \quad 0 \leq m \leq \frac{p-3}{2}$. In this section, we show that it is possible to give some important generalizations to congruences $\phi_m(t) \equiv 0 \bmod p, \quad m = 1, \dots, p-1$.

14.1 General properties of congruences $\phi_m(t) \equiv 0 \bmod p$.

- Recall that u is a primitive root $\bmod p$. Our approach, in proposition 2 p.76 and theorem 8.2 p.79, was to show that, for $f \in \mathbb{N}$, with $\frac{p-1}{2} \geq f \geq min(e_p+2, \frac{p-1}{2})$, there exists $L_{I_f} = \{l_i \quad | \quad l_i \in \mathbb{N}, \quad i = 1, \dots, f\}$, such that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\prod_{i=1}^{f}(x+\zeta^{u_i}y)^{l_i} = \eta \times \gamma^p, \quad \eta \in \mathbb{Z}[\zeta+\zeta^{-1}]^*, \quad \gamma \in \mathbb{Z}[\zeta], \\
&l_i \in \mathbb{N}, \quad 0 \leq i \leq p-1, \quad l_0 \neq 0, \quad l_f \neq 0, \\
&\prod_{i=1}^{f}(\frac{x+\zeta^{u_i}y}{x+\zeta^{-u_i}y})^{l_i} \equiv 1 \bmod \pi^{p+1}, \\
&\prod_{i=1}^{f}(x+\zeta^{u_i}y)^{l_i} - \prod_{i=1}^{f}(x+\zeta^{-u_i}y)^{l_i} \neq 0.
\end{aligned} \tag{133}$$

- Classically, Mirimanoff congruences assert that

$$\phi_{2m+1}(t) \times B_{p-1-2m} \equiv 0 \bmod p.$$

  Observe that these congruences are only for **odd** Mirimanoff Polynomials $\phi_{2m+1}(t)$ because the odd Bernoulli Number are trivially divisible by p. We shall show that, more generally, we can obtain no trivial results also for Mirimanoff Polynomials $\phi_m(T), \quad m = 1, \dots, p-1$.

- We can show that there exists $f' \in \mathbb{N}, \quad f < f' \leq f + \frac{p-3}{2}$, such that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\prod_{i=1}^{f'}(x+\zeta^{u_i}y)^{n_i} \equiv c^p \bmod \pi^{p+1}, \quad c \in \mathbb{Z}, \quad c \not\equiv 0 \bmod p, \\
&n_i \in \mathbb{N}, \quad 0 \leq n_i \leq p-1, \quad n_0 \neq 0, \quad n_{f'} \neq 0, \\
&\prod_{i=1}^{f'}(x+\zeta^{u_i}y)^{n_i} - \prod_{i=1}^{f'}(x+\zeta^{-u_i}y)^{n_i} \neq 0.
\end{aligned} \tag{134}$$

To see these congruences, we apply Dirichlet's boxes principle to unit $\eta \in \mathbb{Z}[\zeta+\zeta^{-1}]^*$

$$\eta = \pm \prod_{i=1}^{(p-3)/2} \eta_i^{\nu_i}, \quad \nu_i \in \mathbb{Z},$$

where $\eta_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, \frac{p-3}{2}$, are a system of fundamental units of $\mathbb{Z}[\zeta+\zeta^{-1}]^*$, noticing that $\eta_i^{\nu_i} \equiv \eta_i^{\nu_i+\alpha_i p} \bmod \pi^{p+1}, \quad \alpha_i \in \mathbb{Z}$.

- Therefore, we get
$$\sum_{i=1}^{f'} \frac{u_i \times n_i}{(x+\zeta^{u_i} y)} \equiv 0 \bmod \pi^{p-1}$$
- Then there exists a **minimal** Fermat congruence rank $r' \leq \frac{p-3}{2} + e_p + 2$, such that
$$\sum_{i=1}^{r'} \frac{u_i n'_i}{(x+\zeta^{u_i} y)} \equiv 0 \bmod \pi^{p-1}. \tag{135}$$
- We get now, similarly to foundation theorem 9.1 p.89,
$$\begin{aligned} &\phi_m^*(t) \times S_m(J_{r'}) \equiv 0 \bmod p, \quad m = 1, \dots, p-1, \\ &S_m(J_{r'}) \equiv \sum_{i=1}^{r'} u_{mi} \times n'_i \bmod p. \end{aligned} \tag{136}$$
- The correspondance, *mutatis mutandis*, between previous theory and this subsection is summarized in notations:
$$\begin{aligned} &f \longleftrightarrow f', \\ &r \longleftrightarrow r', \\ &\phi_{2m+1}^*(t), \quad m = 0, \dots \frac{p-3}{2} \longleftrightarrow \phi_m^*(t), \quad m = 1, \dots, p-1, \\ &I_{\phi^*} = \{2m+1 \quad | \quad 0 \leq m \leq \frac{p-3}{2}, \quad \phi_{2m+1}^*(t) \not\equiv 0 \bmod p\} \\ &\longleftrightarrow \\ &I'_{\phi^*} = \{m \quad | \quad 1 \leq m \leq p-1, \quad \phi_m^*(t) \not\equiv 0 \bmod p\} \end{aligned}$$

14.2 The theorems on $\phi_m(t)$ mod p, $\quad, m = 1, \dots, p-1$

We give now, for Mirimanoff polynomials $\phi_m(t), \quad m = 1, \dots, p-1$, the theorems corresponding to theorem 9.6 p.98, theorem 9.8 p.103, corollary 9.9 p.105 and theorem 9.10 p. 105 for odd polynomials $\phi_{2m+1}(t), \quad m = 0, \dots, \frac{p-3}{2}$.

Theorem 14.1. **** Let $t \equiv -\frac{y}{x}$ mod p. Let r' be the minimal rank of Fermat congruences defined in the relation (135) p.147. If FLT first case fails for p, then there exists exactly $p - r'$ different values $m, \quad m \in \mathbb{N}, \quad 1 \leq m \leq p-1$, such that we have the Mirimanoff polynomial congruences:*

$$\phi_m(t) \equiv 0 \text{ mod } p.$$

Moreover $r' \leq \frac{p+1}{2}$.

Proof. See theorem 9.6 p.98. From Mirimanoff, see Ribenboim [39] (1B) p 145, we get $p - r' \geq \frac{p-1}{2}$, which leads to the result. ☐

Theorem 14.2. **** If FLT first case fails for p, then there exists exactly $\mu' = r' - 1$ different values $m, \quad m \in \mathbb{N}, \quad 1 \leq m \leq p-1$, such that*

$$S_m(J_{r'}) \equiv 0 \text{ mod } p.$$

Corollary 14.3. **** If FLT first case fails for p, then there exists $r' \in \mathbb{N}$, depending only on p and t, such that for any primitive root u mod p, $S_1(J_r) \equiv 0$ mod p and for $m = 2, \dots, p-1$:*

- $\phi_m(t) \times S_m(J_{r'}) \equiv 0$ *mod p,*
- *If $\phi_m(t) \equiv 0$ mod p then $S_m(J_{r'}) \not\equiv 0$ mod p,*
- *If $S_m(J_{r'}) \equiv 0$ mod p then $\phi_m(t) \not\equiv 0$ mod p.*

Theorem 14.4. ***** **An explicit computation of $S_m(J_r)$.**
Let the set I'_ϕ defined by
$I'_\phi = \{m_i \quad | \quad i = 1, \dots, r'-1, \quad \phi^*_{m_i}(t) \not\equiv 0 \text{ mod } p, \quad 1 \leq m_i \leq p-1\}$.

1. *Then an explicit formula for $S_n(J_r)$ is :*

$$S_n(J_r) = u_n \times \prod_{i=1}^{r-1} (u_n - u_{m_i}). \tag{137}$$

2. We have the equivalence

$$\sum_{i=1}^{r'} \frac{u_i l_i}{x+\zeta^{u_i} y} \equiv 0 \ mod\ \pi^{p-1}$$

$$\Longleftrightarrow$$

$$S_n(J_r) = u_n \times \prod_{i=1}^{r'-1} (u_n - u_{m_i})$$

$$\Longleftrightarrow$$

$$l_1 \equiv (-1)^{r'-1} \times \prod_{i=1}^{r-1} u_{m_i} \ mod\ p,$$

$$\vdots$$

$$l_{r'-1} \equiv (-1) \times \sum_{i=1}^{r'-1} u_{m_i} \ mod\ p,$$

$$l_{r'} = 1.$$

14.3 The representation approach for Fermat-Wiles

In this subsection, we take, for the study of odd and even Mirimanoff polynomials $\phi_m(T), \quad m = 1, \dots, p-1$, the approach taken in section 2 p.15 for the study of odd Mirimanoff polynomials $\phi_{2m+1}(T), \quad m = 1, \dots, \frac{p-3}{2}$. We shall give a description of Fermat's equation obtained from action of Galois group $G = Gal(\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)/\mathbb{Q})$ on the class group and also on the unit group of $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$.

14.3.1 A summary on the different p-groups of the Fermat's equation

Recall or fix some notations used in this subsection.

- Let r_p be the p-rank of the class group of the extension $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)/\mathbb{Q}$. We have $r_p = r_p^+ + r_p^-$, where r_p^+ is the p-rank of the class group of the field $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta+\zeta^{-1})$, and r_p^- is the relative class p-group of $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$.
- The ideal $\mathbf{s}$ of Fermat's equation is defined by $\mathbf{s}^p = (x+\zeta y)\mathbb{Z}[\zeta]$.
- The action of $G = Gal(\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)/\mathbb{Q})$ on ideal class group $< Cl(\mathbf{s}) >$ yields

$$\prod_{i=0}^{r_1} (x+\zeta^{u_i} y)^{l_i} = \zeta^v \times \eta \times \gamma^p, \tag{138}$$

$$v \in \mathbb{N}, \quad \eta \in \mathbb{Z}[\zeta+\zeta^{-1}]^*, \quad \gamma \in \mathbb{Q}(\zeta) \quad l_1 \not\equiv 0 \text{ mod } p, \quad l_{r_1} \not\equiv 0 \text{ mod } p.$$

Observe that in first case of FLT then $v \not\equiv 0 \bmod p$. The corresponding polynomial $P_{r_1}(V) = \prod_{i=1}^{r_1}(V - \mu_i)$, $\mu_i \in \mathbf{F}_p$, is the minimal polynomial annihilating the ideal $\mathbf{s}$, so with exponential notation $\mathbf{s}^{P_{r_1}(\sigma)} \simeq \mathbb{Z}[\zeta]$.

- In the same way, the p-rank r_1 can be written $r_1 = r_1^+ + r_1^-$, where r_1^+ is the p-rank of the action of the Galois group of $Gal(\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)/\mathbb{Q})$ on the ideal class group $< Cl(\mathbf{s} \times \overline{\mathbf{s}}) >$, and r_1^-, relative p-rank, corresponds to the action of $Gal(\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)/\mathbb{Q})$ on the ideal class group $< Cl(\mathbf{s}\overline{\mathbf{s}}^{-1}) >$.
- The p-rank r_1^- is the minimal natural number such that

$$\prod_{i=0}^{r_1^-}(\frac{x+\zeta^{u_i}y}{x+\zeta^{-u_i}y})^{l_i} = \zeta^v \times \gamma^p, \quad v \in \mathbb{N}, \quad v \not\equiv 0 \bmod p, \quad \gamma \in \mathbb{Q}(\zeta).$$

  or in exponential notation

$$(\frac{x+\zeta y}{x+\zeta^{-1}y})^{P_{r_1^-}(\sigma)} \simeq \mathbb{Z}[\zeta],$$

- The p-rank r_1^+ is the minimal natural number such that

$$(139) \quad \prod_{i=1}^{r_1^+}(x+\zeta^{u_i}y)^{l_i} \times (x+\zeta^{-u_i}y)^{l_i} = \eta \times \gamma^p, \quad \eta \in \mathbb{Z}[\zeta+\zeta^{-1}]^*, \quad \gamma \in \mathbb{Z}[\zeta+\zeta^{-1}],$$

  or in exponential notation,

$$((x+\zeta y) \times (x+\zeta^{-1}y))^{P_{r_1^+}(\sigma)} \simeq \mathbb{Z}[\zeta+\zeta^{-1}].$$

- The minimal Fermat's congruence rank r defined in relation (95) p.95 is the minimal natural integer such that

$$\prod_{i=0}^{r-1}(\frac{x+\zeta^{u_i}y}{x+\zeta^{-u_i}y})^{n_i} \equiv 1 \bmod \pi^{p+1},$$

  where $n_0 \not\equiv 0 \bmod p$, $n_{r-1} \not\equiv 0 \bmod p$, or in exponential notation

$$(\frac{x+\zeta y}{x+\zeta^{-1}y})^{P_r(\sigma)} \equiv 1 \bmod \pi^{p+1}.$$

  Observe that we have prefered in this article the not too cumbersome notation r instead of r^- because this notation is frequently used.

- The minimal Fermat's congruence rank r^+ is the minimal rational integer such that

$$\prod_{i=0}^{r^+-1}((x+\zeta^{u_i}y)\times(x+\zeta^{-u_i}y))^{n_i^+} \equiv c^p \bmod \pi^{p+1}, \quad c\in\mathbb{Z}. \tag{140}$$

  or in representations notation

$$((x+\zeta^{u}y)\times(x+\zeta^{-u}y))^{P_{r^+}(\sigma)} \equiv c^p \bmod \pi^{p+1}, \quad c\in\mathbb{Z}.$$

- The minimal Fermat's congruence rank r' is the minimal natural integer such that

$$\prod_{i=0}^{r'-1}(x+\zeta^{u_i}y)^{n'_i} - c^{(p\times\sum_{i=1}^{r'} n'_i)} \equiv 0 \bmod \pi^{p-1}, \quad x+y=c^p, \quad c\in\mathbb{Z},$$
$$\prod_{i=0}^{r'-1}(x+\zeta^{u_i}y)^{n'_i} - \prod_{i=0}^{r'-1}(x+\zeta^{-u_i}y)^{n'_i} \neq 0.$$

  This relation can also be written

$$(x+\zeta^{u_i}y)^{P_{r'}(\sigma)} - c^{(p\times\sum_{i=0}^{r'-1} n'_i)} \equiv 0 \bmod \pi^{p+1}, \quad x+y=c^p, \tag{141}$$

  where $P_{r'}(\sigma)$ is the minimal corresponding polynomial.

- Let $r_s\in\mathbb{N}$, (**s** like first letter of sum) be the minimal natural integer such that

$$\prod_{i=0}^{r_s-1}(x+\zeta^{u_i}y)^{n_i} = \gamma^p, \quad \gamma\in\mathbb{Z}[\zeta],$$

  which can be written, for the minimal polynomial $P_{r_s}(\sigma)=\prod_{i=1}^{r_s}(\sigma-\mu_i)$.

- For the unit η verifying the relation (138) p.149, there exists a **minimal** unit rank r_η, defined in relation 36 p. 43 in the section dealing of unit group $\mathbb{Z}[\zeta+\zeta^{-1}]^*$, such that we have congruence in form

$$\eta^{\nu_0}\times\sigma(\eta)^{\nu_1}\times\cdots\times\sigma^{r_\eta-1}(\eta)^{\nu_{r_\eta-1}}\times\sigma^{r_\eta}(\eta)^{\nu_{r_\eta}} = \varepsilon^p, \quad \varepsilon\in\mathbb{Z}[\zeta+\zeta^{-1}]^*, \tag{142}$$

  or, for the minimal polynomial $P_{r_\eta}(V)=\prod_{i=1}^{r_\eta}(V-\mu_i)$, the relation $\eta^{P_{r_\eta}(\sigma)} = \varepsilon^p$.

14.3.2 Some results on Representations approach

In this subsection we shall prove some properties of minimal polynomials.

Lemma 14.5. *Let* $\mathbf{b}$ *be an ideal of* $\mathbb{Z}[\zeta]$*, not principal and with* $\mathbf{b}^p$ *principal. Suppose that for* $\mu \in \mathbf{F}_p^*$*, the ideal* $\mathbf{b}^{\sigma-\mu}$ *is a principal ideal. Then*

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathbf{b}\times\overline{\mathbf{b}}\ \textit{principal} \Leftrightarrow \mu^{(p-1)/2}=-1,\\ &\frac{\mathbf{b}}{\overline{\mathbf{b}}}\ \textit{principal} \Leftrightarrow \mu^{(p-1)/2}=1.\end{aligned}$$

corresponding, for the minimal polynomial $P_{r_1^-}(V)$ *and* $P_{r_1^+}(V)$*, to*

$$\begin{aligned}&P_{r_1^-}(V)=\prod_{i=1}^{r_1^-}(V-\mu_i),\quad \mu_i=u_{2m_i+1},\quad m_i\in\mathbb{N},\quad 1\le m_i\le\frac{p-3}{2},\\ &P_{r_1^+}(V)=\prod_{i=1}^{r_1^+}(V-\mu_i),\quad \mu_i=u_{2m_i},\quad m_i\in\mathbb{N},\quad 1\le m_i\le\frac{p-1}{2}.\end{aligned}$$

Proof.

- If $\mathbf{b}\times\overline{\mathbf{b}}$ is principal then $\mathbf{b}^{\sigma^{(p-1)/2}+1}$ is principal. From hypothesis $\mathbf{b}^{\sigma-\mu}$ is principal, so $\mathbf{b}^{\sigma^{(p-1)/2}-\mu^{(p-1)/2}}$ is principal. $\mu^{(p-1)/2}=1$ should imply that $\mathbf{b}^{\sigma^{(p-1)/2}-1}$ is principal, thus, with $\mathbf{b}^{\sigma^{(p-1)/2}+1}$ principal, it should imply that $\mathbf{b}$ is principal, contradiction.
- If $\mu^{(p-1)/2}=-1$ then from $\mathbf{b}^{\sigma-\mu}$ principal, we get $\mathbf{b}^{\sigma^{(p-1)/2}-\mu^{(p-1)/2}}$ principal, and so $\mathbf{b}^{\sigma^{(p-1)/2}+1}$ principal or $\mathbf{b}\times\overline{\mathbf{b}}$ principal.
- Similar proof if $\frac{\mathbf{b}}{\overline{\mathbf{b}}}$ is principal.

□

Lemma 14.6. $r^+\le r_p^+ + r_\eta$.

Proof. From relation (139) p. 150 of definition of the rank r_1^+, we get

$$\prod_{i=1}^{r_1^+}(x+\zeta^{u_i}y)^{n_i}(x+\zeta^{-u_i}y)^{n_i}=\eta\times\gamma_1^p,\quad \eta\in\mathbb{Z}[\zeta+\zeta^{-1}]^*,\quad \gamma_1\in\mathbb{Z}[\zeta+\zeta^{-1}].$$

From definition of the unit ranks r_η, we get

$$\prod_{j=0}^{r_\eta}\sigma^j(\eta)^{n'_j}\equiv c^p \bmod \pi^p,\quad c\in\mathbb{Z},\quad c\not\equiv 0 \bmod p.$$

Gathering these two relations we get

$$\prod_{i=1}^{r_1^+ + r_\eta} (x+\zeta^{u_i}y)^{m_i}(x+\zeta^{-u_i}y)^{m_i} \equiv c_2^p \bmod \pi^p, \quad c_2 \in \mathbb{Z}, \quad c_2 \not\equiv 0 \bmod p.$$

The minimal congruence rank r^+ defined in relation (140) p. 151 is the minimal integer such that

$$\prod_{i=1}^{r^+}(x+\zeta^{u_i}y)^{l_i}(x+\zeta^{-u_i}y)^{l_i} \equiv c^p \bmod \pi^p, \quad c \in \mathbb{Z}.$$

From these definitions, we get $r^+ \leq r_1^+ + r_\eta$. Clearly $r_1^+ \leq r_p^+$ which achieves the proof. □

14.3.3 A summary on the ranks and minimal polynomials

Here we summarize some relations obtained between the different ranks, the different minimal polynomials.

- The minimal corresponding polynomials of the indeterminate V, all dividing the polynomial $V^{p-1}-1=\prod_{i=1}^{p-1}(V-i)$, can be written in form

(143)

$$
\begin{aligned}
&P_{r_1}(V)=\prod_{i=1}^{r_1}(V-\mu_i), \quad \mu_i\in\mathbf{F}_p, \quad i_1\neq i_2\Rightarrow\mu_{i_1}\neq\mu_{i_2},\\
&P_{r_1^-}(V)=\prod_{i=1}^{r_1^-}(V-\mu_i), \quad \mu_i\in\mathbf{F}_p, \quad i_1\neq i_2\Rightarrow\mu_{i_1}\neq\mu_{i_2}, \quad \mu_i=u_{2m_i+1},\\
&P_{r_1^+}(V)=\prod_{i=1}^{r_1^+}(V-\mu_i), \quad \mu_i\in\mathbf{F}_p, \quad i_1\neq i_2\Rightarrow\mu_{i_1}\neq\mu_{i_2}, \quad \mu_i=u_{2m_i},\\
&P_{r}(V)=\prod_{i=1}^{r-1}(V-\mu_i), \quad \mu_i\in\mathbf{F}_p, \quad i_1\neq i_2\Rightarrow\mu_{i_1}\neq\mu_{i_2}, \quad \mu_i=u_{2m_i+1},\\
&P_{r^+}(V)=\prod_{i=1}^{r^+}(V-\mu_i), \quad \mu_i\in\mathbf{F}_p, \quad i_1\neq i_2\Rightarrow\mu_{i_1}\neq\mu_{i_2}, \quad \mu_i=u_{2m_i},\\
&P_{r'}(V)=\prod_{i=1}^{r'-1}(V-\mu_i), \quad \mu_i\in\mathbf{F}_p, \quad i_1\neq i_2\Rightarrow\mu_{i_1}\neq\mu_{i_2},\\
&P_{r_s}(V)=\prod_{i=1}^{r_s}(V-\mu_i), \quad \mu_i\in\mathbf{F}_p, \quad i_1\neq i_2\Rightarrow\mu_{i_1}\neq\mu_{i_2},\\
&P_{r_\eta}(V)=\prod_{i=1}^{r_\eta}(V-\mu_i), \quad \mu_i\in\mathbf{F}_p, \quad i_1\neq i_2\Rightarrow\mu_{i_1}\neq\mu_{i_2}, \quad \mu_i=u_{2m_i}.
\end{aligned}
$$

- The minimal polynomials verify the following divisibility properties :

$$
\begin{aligned}
&P_{r_1^-}(V)\times P_{r_1^+}(V)=P_{r_1}(V),\\
&P_r(V)\mid P_{r_1^-}(V)\times(V-u),\\
&P_r(V)\mid P_{r'}(V),\\
&P_{r'}(V)\mid P_{r_1}(V)\times(V-u)\times P_{r_\eta}(V)=P_{r_s}(V).
\end{aligned}
\tag{144}
$$

- The different ranks verify the inequalities:

$$
\begin{aligned}
&r_1 = r_1^- + r_1^+,\\
&r_1^- \leq r_p^-,\\
&r_1^+ \leq r_p^+,\\
&r - 1 \leq r_1^- + 1,\\
&r^+ \leq r_1^+ + r_\eta,\\
&r' - 1 \leq r_s = r_1 + r_\eta + 1.
\end{aligned}
\tag{145}
$$

- In this relation (145), the difference $r_1^- - (r-1)$ corresponds to the singular primary C_i among the r_1^- terms C_i of the formula

  $$\frac{x+\zeta y}{x+\zeta^{-1}y} = \zeta^{2v} \times \prod_{i=1}^{r_1^-} C_i^{\nu_i} \times \gamma^p, \quad \gamma \in \mathbb{Q}(\zeta), \quad v \in \mathbf{F}_p^*,$$

  where C_i are defined in relation (18) p. 28. In fact these $C_i \equiv 1 \bmod \pi^p$ can be neglected in $\bmod \pi^p$ congruences.

- In this relation (145), the difference $r_s^- - (r'-1)$ corresponds to the singular primary η_i among the r_η units η_i of the relation

  $$x + \zeta y = \zeta^v \times \prod_{i=1}^{r_1} C_i^{\nu_i} \times \prod_{j=1}^{r_\eta} \eta_j^{\delta_j} \times \gamma^p, \quad \gamma \in \mathbb{Q}(\zeta), \quad \nu_i, \delta_j, v \in \mathbf{F}_p^*,$$

  where units η_i are those of the relation 40 p. 45. In fact these units $\eta_j \equiv c^p \bmod \pi^p, \quad c \in \mathbf{F}_p^*$ can be neglected in $\bmod \pi^p$ congruences.

14.3.4 On singular integers and minimal polynomial $P_{r_s}(V)$.

Recall that the polynomial $P_{r_s}(V)$ of the indeterminate V is the minimal polynomial such that

$$(x+\zeta y)^{P_{r_s}(\sigma)} = \gamma^p, \quad \gamma \in \mathbb{Z}[\zeta].$$

Let us consider the method of singular integers explained in Ribenboim, [39] paragraph 4. p 170 : an element $b \in \mathbb{Z}[\zeta]$ is said to be a singular integer if there exists an ideal $\mathbf{b}$ such that $b\mathbb{Z}[\zeta] = \mathbf{b}^p$. In that sense, in the Fermat's equation with $z \not\equiv 0 \bmod p$ then $x + \zeta y$ with $(x+\zeta y)\mathbb{Z}[\zeta] = \mathbf{s}^p$, is a singular integer. Let V be an indeterminate. Let the polynomial $H(V) \in \mathbf{F_p}[V]$ defined by

$$H(V) = \sum_{i=0}^{p-2} \frac{u \times u_{-i} - u_{-i+1}}{p} \times V^i.$$

Let us define also the $p-2$ polynomials

$$I_a(V)=\sum_{i=0}^{p-2}([\frac{(a+1)\times u_i}{p}]-[\frac{a\times u_i}{p}])\times V^{p-2-i},\quad a=1,\dots,p-2.$$

We get the lemma on the polynomial $P_{r_s}(V)$.

Lemma 14.7.

$$P_{r_s}(V)\mid (V-u)\times H(V).$$
$$P_{r_s}(V)\mid (V-u)\times I_a(V),\quad a=1,\dots,p-2.$$

Proof. $P_{r_s}(V)$ is the minimal polynomial such that

$$(x+\zeta y)^{P_{r_s}(\sigma)}=\gamma_1^p,\quad \gamma_1\in\mathbb{Z}[\zeta].$$

From Inkeri [19], cited in Ribenboim [39], (4A)-2 p 171, we get

$$(x+\zeta y)^{H(\sigma)}=\zeta^{v_2}\times\gamma_2^p,\quad \gamma_2\in\mathbb{Z}[\zeta].$$

We derive

$$(x+\zeta y)^{(\sigma-u)\times H(\sigma)}=(\gamma_2')^p,\quad \gamma_2'\in\mathbb{Z}[\zeta],$$

which implies that the minimal polynomial $P_{r_s}(V)$ divides the polynomial $(V-u)\times H(V)$. The end of the proof is similar starting of the result of a result of Fueter [12] cited in Ribenboim [39] (4C)-2 p 172. □

Remarks:

- Observe that the coefficients $\delta_i(a)=[\frac{(a+1)\times u_i}{p}]-[\frac{a\times u_i}{p}]$ of the polynomial $I_a(V)$ verify
$$\delta_i(a)\in\{0,1\},\quad i=0,\dots,p-2,\quad a=1,\dots,p-2.$$
- Observe, as an example, that for $a=1$ then
$$I_1(V)=\sum_{i=0,\quad u_i>p/2}^{p-2}V^{p-2-i}.$$
- A numerical MAPLE observation has allowed to observe: Let $d(V)$ be the polynomial in $\mathbf{F}_p[V]$ of the indeterminate V defined by
$$d(V)=Gcd(I_a(V)\mid a=1,\dots,p-2).$$

Let the two polynomials $P^-(V)$ and $P^+(V)$ of the indeterminate V defined by

$$P^-(V) = Gcd(V^{(p-1)/2}+1, d(V)),$$
$$P^+(V) = Gcd(V^{(p-1)/2}-1, d(V)).$$

We have observed that $P^+(V) = 1+V+\cdots+V^{p-3}2$, for $h^+ \not\equiv 0 \bmod p$, the relations

$$\text{(146)} \qquad \begin{aligned} \text{degree}_V(P^-(V)) &= \text{ index of irregularity of } p, \\ \text{degree}_V(P^+(V)) &= \frac{p-3}{2}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore this should lead to $d(V) = P_{r_1^-}(V)$, general observation independant of Fermat which could also be a strong tool for first case of FLT.

- Observe that these results given in the case of Fermat's equation for the singular integer $x+\zeta y$, $\quad (x+\zeta y)\mathbb{Z}[\zeta] = \mathbf{s}^p$, can be formulated for the minimal polynomial of any singular integer b.

14.3.5 Congruences on Mirimanoff polynomials

We give here an application to Mirimanoff polynomials in Fermat context. Let p be a prime, $p > 5$.

Theorem 14.8. *Let $p > 5$ be a prime. If FLT first case would fail for p there should be* **at most** *$r_\eta + r_p^+$ Mirimanoff's polynomials $\phi_{2m}(T)$ with $\phi_{2m}(t) \not\equiv 0 \bmod p$, $\quad 1 \leq m \leq \frac{p-1}{2}$.*

Proof.

- Recall that $(x+\zeta y)^{P_{r_1}(\sigma)} = \zeta^v \times \eta \times \gamma^p$, $\quad \eta \in \mathbb{Z}[\zeta+\zeta^{-1}]^*$, $\quad \gamma \in \mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$, and that $E(\eta) = E(\eta_1) \times \cdots \times E(\eta_{r_\eta})$, $\quad E(\sigma(\eta_i)) = E(\eta_i^{\mu_i})$, $\quad i = 1, \dots, r_\eta$.
- Let the minimal polynomial $P_{r'}(V)$ defined in relation (143) p.154. We have seen in relation (144) p.154 that

  $$\text{(147)} \qquad P_{r'}(V) \mid P_{r_1^-}(V) \times P_{r_1^+}(V) \times (V-u) \times P_{r_\eta}(V).$$

  Let $\mu = u_{2m}$ with $(V-\mu) \mid P_{r'}(V)$. We have $(V-\mu) \nmid P_{r_1^-}(V)$ because $P_{r_1^-}(V) = \prod_{i=1}^{r_1^-}(V-\mu_i)$, $\quad \mu_i = u_{2m_i+1}$. We have also $V-\mu \nmid V-u$. Therefore $V-\mu \mid P_{r_1^+}(V) \times P_{r_\eta}(V)$ and even

  $$V-\mu \mid lcm(P_{r_1^+}(V), P_{r_\eta}(V)).$$

□

15 FLT first case: Hilbert's class field of $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$ approach

This section contains :

1. a general application of properties of p-Hilbert's class field of $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$ to FLT,
2. some properties of unit ε of Fermat's equation in p-Hilbert class field H of $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$.

15.1 Application of Hilbert's class field to FLT

We apply these explicit computations of p-elementary Hilbert's class field to FLT context. A first application when $h^+ \not\equiv 0 \bmod p$ is derived directly from theorem 4.4 p. 56.

Theorem 15.1. *Suppose that* $h^+ \not\equiv 0$ *mod* p*. If* $\prod_{i=1}^{r}(\frac{x+\zeta^{u_i}y}{x+\zeta^{-u_i}y})^{l_i} \equiv 1$ *mod* π^p *then* $\prod_{i=1}^{r}(\frac{x+\zeta^{u_i}y}{x+\zeta^{-u_i}y})^{l_i} = \gamma^p, \quad \gamma \in \mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$.

Let H be the p-elementary Hilbert field of $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$. Let B_H be the ring of integers of H. Let B_H^* be the group of units of B_H. Let $Gal(H/\mathbb{Q}(zeta)$ be the Galois group of the extension of $H/\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$. With a second approach, from Principal Ideal Theorem, the Fermat's equation with $z \not\equiv 0 \bmod p$ becomes in B_H:

$$x+\zeta y = \varepsilon \times \gamma^p, \quad \gamma \in B_H, \quad \varepsilon \in B_H^*,$$

because the ideal $\mathbf{s}$ with $\mathbf{s}^p = (x+\zeta y)\mathbb{Z}[\zeta]$ becomes principal in B_H.

Theorem 15.2. **** Let* x, y, z *be a solution of Fermat's equation with* $z \not\equiv 0$ *mod* p*. The Fermat's equation becomes in the ring of integers* B_H *of the* p*-elementary Hilbert class field* H

$$x+\zeta y = \varepsilon \times \gamma^p, \quad \gamma \in B_H, \quad \varepsilon \in B_H^*. \tag{148}$$

with

$$\frac{\theta(\varepsilon)}{\varepsilon} = \varepsilon_1^p, \quad \varepsilon_1 \in B_H^*, \quad \forall\ \theta \in Gal(H/\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)). \tag{149}$$

Proof. Let us consider the relation seen before

$$x+\zeta y = \varepsilon \times \gamma^p, \quad \gamma \in B_H, \quad \varepsilon \in B_H^*.$$

We have

$$\theta(x+\zeta y) = x+\zeta y$$

and so

$$\theta(\varepsilon)\times\theta(\gamma^p)=\varepsilon\times\gamma^p. \tag{150}$$

We have $\frac{\theta(\varepsilon)}{\varepsilon}\in B_H^*$ and $\frac{\theta(\varepsilon)}{\varepsilon}=\frac{\gamma^p}{\theta(\gamma^p)}\in H^p$; thus $\frac{\theta(\varepsilon)}{\varepsilon}\in B_H^*\cap H^p$ and finally $\frac{\theta(\varepsilon)}{\varepsilon}=\varepsilon_1^p,\quad \varepsilon_1\in B_H^*$, which achieves the proof. □

Question: Does there exists a way to caracterize units verifying strong relation (149) p.158?

15.2 Some congruences on unit ε of Fermat's equation in p-Hilbert class field H.

This subsection contains a study of the units of the Fermat's equation in the p-Hilbert class field:

- with a representations of $Gal(\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)/\mathbb{Q})$ approach,
- with an application of the Dirichlet's theorem on units.

15.2.1 A representation approach

- Let r_p be the p-rank of the class group $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$.
- Let H be the p-elementary Hilbert class field of $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$,

  $$H=\mathbb{Q}(\zeta,\omega_1,\dots,\omega_{r_p}).$$

  Let B_H be the ring of integers of H.
- Let us consider the Fermat's equation in B_H,

  $$x+\zeta y=\varepsilon\times\gamma^p,\quad \varepsilon\in B_H^*,\quad \gamma\in B_H.$$

- The extension $H/\mathbb{Q}$ is Galois. Let Θ be the $\mathbb{Q}$-isomorphisms of $H/\mathbb{Q}$. Let θ be the $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$-isomorphisms of $H/\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$. The $\mathbb{Q}$-isomorphism σ of H, extending the $\mathbb{Q}$-isomorphism $\sigma:\zeta\rightarrow\zeta^u$ of $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$, has been defined in relations (60) p.57 and (61) p.57.

  $$\Theta=\theta\circ\sigma^k,\quad \forall\theta\in Gal(H/\mathbb{Q}(\zeta),\quad k=0,\dots,p-2.$$

- From relation (149) p.158, we have

  $$\theta \circ \sigma^k(\frac{\varepsilon}{\overline{\varepsilon}}) \equiv \sigma^k(\frac{\varepsilon}{\overline{\varepsilon}}) \bmod (B_H^*)^p, \quad \forall \theta \in Gal(H/\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)), \quad k = 0, \dots, p-2,$$

  or

  $$\theta \circ \sigma^k(\frac{\varepsilon}{\overline{\varepsilon}}) = \frac{\varepsilon}{\overline{\varepsilon}} \times \varepsilon_2^p, \quad \varepsilon_2 \in B_H^*.$$

- Let $r_1 \leq r_p$ be the p-rank of the action of $Gal(\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)/\mathbb{Q}$ on the p-class group $< Cl(\mathbf{s}) >, \quad \mathbf{s}^p = (x + \zeta y)\mathbb{Z}[\zeta]$.

- We have proved in theorem 8.2 p.79 that there exists $l_i, \quad i = 0, \dots, r_1$, such that

  $$\prod_{i=0}^{r_1} (\frac{x + \zeta^{u_i} y}{x + \zeta^{-u_i} y})^{l_i} = \gamma_\zeta^p, \quad \gamma_\zeta \in \mathbb{Q}(\zeta).$$

  Therefore, from the Fermat's equation $x + \zeta y = \varepsilon \times \gamma^p$ in H, we get

  $$\prod_{i=0}^{r_1} \sigma^i(\frac{\varepsilon}{\overline{\varepsilon}})^{l_i} \times \prod_{i=0}^{r_1} (\frac{\gamma}{\overline{\gamma}})^{pl_i} = \gamma_\zeta^p, \quad \gamma_\zeta \in \mathbb{Q}(\zeta).$$

Thus, we have proved

Lemma 15.3. *Let the Fermat's equation in B_H*

$$x + \zeta y = \varepsilon \times \gamma^p, \quad \varepsilon \in B_H^*, \quad \gamma \in B_H.$$

There exists a minimal $r_\varepsilon \in \mathbb{N}, \quad 1 \leq r_\varepsilon \leq r_1$, such that

$$\prod_{i=0}^{r_\varepsilon} \sigma^i(\frac{\varepsilon}{\overline{\varepsilon}})^{m_i} = \varepsilon_H^p, \quad \varepsilon_H \in B_H^*, \quad m_i \in \mathbb{N}, \quad m_0 \neq 0, \quad m_{r_\varepsilon} \neq 0.$$

It is possible to formulate this result in terms of representations.

Lemma 15.4. *Let the Fermat's equation in B_H*

$$x + \zeta y = \varepsilon \times \gamma^p, \quad \varepsilon \in B_H^*, \quad \gamma \in B_H.$$

There exists a minimal rank $r_\varepsilon \leq r_1 \leq r_p$ and a minimal polynomial $P_{r_\varepsilon}(\sigma) \in \mathbf{F}_p[G]$ such that

$$(\frac{\varepsilon}{\overline{\varepsilon}})^{P_{r_\varepsilon}(\sigma)} = \varepsilon_H^p, \quad \varepsilon_H \in B_H^p.$$

For the indeterminate V, $P_{r_\varepsilon}(V) | P_{r_1}(V)$.

Proof. We have shown that $(\frac{\varepsilon}{\overline{\varepsilon}})^{P_{r_1}(\sigma)} \in (B_H^*)^p$ in lemma 15.3 p.160. We apply the representation of G like in section 2 p.15 to get the result. □

15.2.2 An application of Dirichlet's units theorem in $H/\mathbb{Q}$

We shall give a criterion on system of fundamental units of Hilbet class field H of $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$ verified when FLT holds for p.

- Let $\rho = \frac{(p-1)\times p^{r_p}}{2} - 1$ be the rank of the group of units B_H^*.
- Let $\eta_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, \rho$, be a system of fundamental units of B_H^*.
- For each $\theta \in Gal(H/\mathbb{Q}(\zeta))$ we have a system of relations

$$\begin{aligned}
&\theta(\eta_1) = \eta_1^{\mu_{1,1}} \times \dots \times \eta_\rho^{\mu_{1,\rho}},\\
&\vdots\\
&\theta(\eta_i) = \eta_1^{\mu_{i,1}} \times \dots \times \eta_\rho^{\mu_{i,\rho}},\\
&\vdots\\
&\theta(\eta_\rho) = \eta_1^{\mu_{\rho,1}} \times \dots \times \eta_\rho^{\mu_{\rho,\rho}}.
\end{aligned}$$

- Let ε be the unit of the Fermat's equation:

$$\varepsilon = \eta_1^{\nu_1} \times \dots \times \eta_\rho^{\nu_\rho}.$$

  We have seen that $\frac{\theta(\varepsilon)}{\varepsilon} = \varepsilon_1^p, \quad \varepsilon_1 \in B_H^*$. From these relations, we get the linear system of ρ congruences $\mod p$ on the ρ indeterminates $\nu_j, \quad j = 1, \dots, \rho$:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mu_{1,1} \times \nu_1 + \dots + \mu_{j,1} \times \nu_j + \dots + \mu_{\rho,1} \times \nu_\rho \equiv \nu_1 \mod p,\\
&\vdots\\
&\mu_{1,i} \times \nu_1 + \dots + \mu_{j,i} \times \nu_j + \dots + \mu_{\rho,i} \times \nu_\rho \equiv \nu_i \mod p,\\
&\vdots\\
&\mu_{1,\rho} \times \nu_1 + \dots + \mu_{j,\rho} \times \nu_j + \dots + \mu_{\rho,\rho} \times \nu_\rho \equiv \nu_\rho \mod p.
\end{aligned}$$

- This implies that the determinant $M(p,\theta)$ depending only on p and $\theta \in Gal(H/\mathbb{Q}(\zeta))$

$$M(p,\theta) = \begin{vmatrix}
\mu_{1,1} - 1 & \dots & \mu_{j,1} & \dots & \mu_{\rho,1}\\
\vdots & & \vdots & & \\
\mu_{1,j} & \dots & \mu_{j,j} - 1 & \dots & \mu_{\rho,j}\\
\vdots & & \vdots & & \\
\mu_{1,\rho} & \dots & \mu_{j,\rho} & \dots & \mu_{\rho,\rho} - 1
\end{vmatrix} \tag{151}$$

verifies the congruence $M(p,\theta)\equiv 0 \bmod p$. We have obtained the result :

Theorem 15.5. *If there exists a sytem* $\eta_i, \quad i=1,\dots,\rho$, *of fundamental units of* B_H^* *and one* $\theta\in Gal(H/\mathbb{Q}(\zeta))$, *such that the determinant* $M(p,\theta)\not\equiv 0$ *mod* p, *then FLT first case holds for* p.

Remark : Observe that, in this theorem, we give a criterion for first case of FLT depending only on p and structure of the units group of the p-elementary Hilbert class field of $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$. It does not depends on x,y,z verifying Fermat's equation.

16 FLT first case: An improvement of Kummer's result on Jacobi resolvents

In this chapter, we improve some classical Kummer's results on FLT resting on Jacobi resolvents. It contains:

1. some general definitions, subsection independant of FLT,
2. some properties of Kummer's method of annihilation of ideals classes of the relative p-class group, subsection independant of FLT,
3. some applications in FLT context.

16.1 Some definitions

These results are in relation with Kummer results [25] mentionned in Ribenboim, [39] p119. These definitions faithfully follows ([39]) page 118-119.

- Let $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$; recall that $[a, b] = \{\alpha \quad | \alpha \in \mathbb{R}, \quad a \leq \alpha \leq b\}$ and that $[a, b[= \{\alpha \quad | \alpha \in \mathbb{R}, \quad a \leq \alpha < b\}$.
- In this section, when $r \equiv a \mod p$, then r verifies $0 \leq r \leq p-1$.
- Let $u \in \mathbb{N}$ be a primitive root $\mod p$. Let $\sigma : \mathbb{Q}(\zeta) \to \mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$ be the $\mathbb{Q}$-isomorphism defined by $\sigma(\zeta) = \zeta^u$.
- Let $u_i \equiv u^i \mod p, \quad 1 \leq u_i \leq p-1$. Note that, if $i < 0$, then this is to be understood as $u_i \times u^{-i} \equiv 1 \mod p$. Note that $u_{ij} \equiv u^{ij} \equiv (u^i)^j \equiv u_i^j \equiv (u_i)_j \mod p$. Note that $u_i \equiv u_{i \mod p-1}$.
- Let $d \in \mathbb{N}, \quad 1 \leq d \leq p-2$. Let $\nu = \frac{p-1}{2}$. Let $s = ind_u(d) \in \mathbb{N}, \quad 0 \leq s \leq p-2$ be defined by $d \equiv u^s \mod p$. There exists always one and only one s because u is a primitive root $\mod p$ and therefore $ind_u(d)$ is well defined.
- Let $I(u, d)$, and if there is no ambiguity $I(d)$, be the set defined by

  $$(152) \qquad I(d) = \{i \quad | \quad 1 \leq i \leq p-1, \quad u_{\nu-i} + u_{\nu-i+ind_u(d)} > p\}.$$

- Let $q \in \mathbb{N}, \quad q \equiv 1 \mod p$, be a prime. Let $\mathbf{q} \subset \mathbb{Z}[\zeta]$ be a prime ideal above q. The relation (2.5) p119 of [39] says that $\prod_{i \in I(u,d)} \sigma^i(\mathbf{q})$ is a principal integral ideal of $\mathbb{Z}[\zeta]$.
- We shall prove here also two properties of $I(d)$ used in the sequel of this article:

- Let $I'(d) = \{i' \quad | \quad 1 \le i' \le p-1, \quad i' \notin I(d)\}$. From [39] p 121, (line after relation 4.5), $i' \in I'(d) \Longleftrightarrow i' \equiv i + \frac{p-1}{2} \mod p-1$ where $i \in I(d)$. Observe that we write $i' \equiv i + \frac{p-1}{2} \mod (p-1)$ and not $\mod p$ that we think to be a print error of Ribenboim book, we shall detail under why:
- $Card(I(d)) = Card(I'(d)) = \frac{p-1}{2}$.

Let $i \in I(d)$; Let $i' = i \pm \frac{p-1}{2}, \quad 1 \le i' \le p-1$. Let us consider the quantities

$$\begin{aligned} &u_{\nu-i} = r_1, \quad 1 \le r_1 \le p-1,\\ &u_{\nu-i+ind_u(d)} = r_2, \quad 1 \le r_2 \le p-1,\\ &u_{\nu-i} + u_{\nu-i+ind_u(d)} = r_1 + r_2,\\ &u_{\nu-i'} = p - r_1,\\ &u_{\nu-i'+ind_u(d)} = p - r_2,\\ &u_{\nu-i'} + u_{\nu-i'+ind_u(d)} = p - r_1 + p - r_2. \end{aligned} \tag{153}$$

Show that

$$i \in I(d) \Leftrightarrow i' \equiv i + \frac{p-1}{2} \mod p-1 \in I'(d). \tag{154}$$

- If $i \in I(d)$ then $r_1 + r_2 > p$ so $p - r_1 + p - r_2 < p$ and $i' \notin I(d)$.
- If $i' \notin I(d)$ then $p - r_1 + p - r_2 \le p$ so $r_1 + r_2 \ge p$.
  - if $r_1 + r_2 = p$ then $u_{\nu-i} + (d \times u_{\nu-i} \mod p) = p$ so $u_{\nu-i} + d \times u_{\nu-i} \equiv 0 \mod p$, thus $d+1 \equiv 0 \mod p$ which contradicts hypothesis assumed $1 \le d \le p-2$.
  - if $r_1 + r_2 > p$ then $i \in I(d)$ and we are done.

Note that it implies that $Card(I(d)) = Card(I'(d)) = \frac{p-1}{2}$.

- We complete these notations by the definition of the set

$$K(d) = \{k \quad | \quad k = p-1-i, \quad i \in I(d)\}. \tag{155}$$

16.2 Elementary properties of sets $I(d)$

This subsection deals of cyclotomic fields independently of FLT.

Lemma 16.1. *For $d = 1, \dots, p-2$, we have*

$$I(d) = I(p-1-d). \tag{156}$$

Proof. We have

$$I(d) = \{i \quad | \quad u_{\nu-i} + d \times u_{\nu-i} \bmod p > p\}, \tag{157}$$

and

$$I(p-1-d) = \{i \quad | \quad u_{\nu-i} + ((p-1-d) \times u_{\nu-i} \bmod p) > p\}. \tag{158}$$

Let $i \in I(p-1-d)$. Let us consider r_1 and r_2 defined in relation (153) p. 164. If $(r_1 + r_2) \leq p$ then

$$(p-1-d) \times u_{\nu-i} \bmod p = p - r_1 - r_2,$$

and then, from equation (158) p.165, we obtain $r_1 + p - r_1 - r_2 > p$ contradiction, thus $r_1 + r_2 > p$ which implies that $i \in I(d)$. $\square$

Lemma 16.2. *$I(1) = \{i \quad | \quad u_i \equiv -j^{-1}$ mod $p, \quad | \quad \frac{p}{2} < j < p\}$.*

Proof. Let us evaluate $I(1)$. We have $u^{ind_u(1)} \equiv 1 \mod p$ and so

$$I(1) = \{i \quad | \quad 0 \leq i \leq p-2, \quad (u_{\nu-i} + u_{\nu-i}) > p\}.$$

Therefore, we have

$$K(1) = \{k \quad | \quad 1 \leq k \leq p-1, \quad (u_{\nu+k} + u_{\nu+k}) > p\}.$$

so $p > j = u_{\nu+k} = u_{\nu-i} > \frac{p}{2}$. But $u_i \equiv -(u_{\nu-i})^{-1} \equiv -j^{-1} \bmod p$, because $u^\nu \equiv -1 \bmod p$, and finally

$$I(1) = \{i \quad | \quad u_i \equiv -j^{-1} \bmod p, \quad \frac{p}{2} < j < p\}.$$

$\square$

Remark : Observe that we have $Card(I(1)) = \frac{p-1}{2}$.

Lemma 16.3. *$I(2) = \{i \quad | \quad u_i \equiv j^{-1}$ mod $p, \quad j \in [\frac{p}{3}, \frac{p}{2}] \cup [\frac{2p}{3}, p-1]\}$.*

Proof. From $u^{ind_u(2)} \equiv 2 \mod p$, we have

$$I(2) = \{i \quad | \quad 0 \leq i \leq p-2, \quad (u_{\nu-i} + (2u_{\nu-i} \bmod p)) > p\}.$$

Therefore, we have

$$K(2) = \{k \quad | \quad 1 \leq k \leq p-1, \quad (u_{\nu+k} + (2u_{\nu+k} \bmod p)) > p\}.$$

If $u_{\nu+k} < \frac{p}{2}$ then $(2u_{\nu+k} \bmod p) = 2u_{\nu+k}$ leads to $u_{\nu+k} > \frac{p}{3}$, hence $\frac{p}{3} < j = u_{\nu+k} < \frac{p}{2}$. If $u_{\nu+k} > \frac{p}{2}$ then $(2u_{\nu+k} \bmod p) = 2u_{\nu+k} - p$ leads to $p > u_{\nu+k} > \frac{2p}{3}$ then to $\frac{2p}{3} < j = u_{\nu+k} < p$.

But $u_i \equiv -(u_{\nu-i})^{-1} \equiv -j^{-1} \bmod p$, because $u^\nu \equiv -1 \bmod p$ and finally

$$I(2) = \{i \quad | \quad u_i \equiv -j^{-1} \bmod p, \quad j \in [\frac{p}{3}, \frac{p}{2}] \cup [\frac{2p}{3}, p-1]\}.$$

□

Lemma 16.4.

$$I(k) = \{i \quad | \quad u_i \equiv -j^{-1} \ mod\ p, \quad 1 \le j \le p-1, \quad j \in \cup_{l=1}^{k} [\frac{l \times p}{k+1}, \frac{l \times p}{k}[\}.$$

Proof. generalization of lemmas 16.2 p.165 and 16.3 p.165. □

Lemma 16.5. *Let* $J_k = \cup_{i=1}^{k} I(k)$. *Then*

$$J_k = \{i \quad | \quad u_i \equiv -j^{-1} \ mod\ p, \quad \frac{p}{k+1} < j \le p-1\}.$$

Proof. Apply lemmas 16.2 p.165, 16.3 p.165 and 16.4 p.166. More precisely, we have

$$I(1) = \{i \quad | \quad u_i \equiv -j^{-1} \bmod p, \quad j \in [\frac{p}{2}, p-1]\}.$$

and

$$I(2) = \{i \quad | \quad u_i \equiv -j^{-1} \bmod p, \quad j \in [\frac{p}{3}, \frac{p}{2}] \cup [\frac{2p}{3}, p-1]\}.$$

Then, we get

$$I(1) \cup I(2) = \{i \quad | \quad u_i \equiv -\jmath^{-1} \bmod p \quad | \quad j \in [\frac{p}{3}, p-1]\}$$

and so on. □

Lemma 16.6. *Let* $J_k = \cap_{i=1}^{k} I(k)$. *Then*

$$J_k = \{i \quad | \quad u_i \equiv -j^{-1} \ mod\ p, \quad \frac{kp}{(k+1)} < j \le p-1\}.$$

Proof. We have

$$I(1) = \{i \quad | \quad u_i \equiv -j^{-1} \bmod p, \quad j \in [\frac{p}{2}, p-1]\}.$$

We have

$$I(2) = \{i \quad | \quad u_i \equiv -j^{-1} \bmod p, \quad j \in [\frac{p}{3}, \frac{p}{2}] \cup [\frac{2p}{3}, p-1]\}.$$

Then, we get

$$I(1) \cap I(2) = \{i \quad | \quad u_i \equiv -\jmath^{-1} \bmod p, \quad j \in [\frac{2p}{3}, p-1]\}$$

and so on. □

16.3 Some Kummer's principal ideals

This subsection deals of cyclotomic fields independently of FLT. Let us denote $I(d_1,\dots,d_k)=\cup_{i=1}^k I(d_i)$. Let us denote $J(d_1,\dots,d_k)=\cap_{i=1}^k I(d_i)$. Let $\mathbf{q}$ be a prime ideal of $\mathbb{Z}[\zeta]$ of inertial degree 1. Kummer showed that the ideal $\prod_{i\in I(d)}\sigma^i(\mathbf{q}),\quad d=1,\dots,p-2$, is a principal ideal of $\mathbb{Z}[\zeta]$. Let C_p be the class group of $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)/\mathbb{Q}$. Let C_p^+ be the class group of $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta+\zeta^{-1})/\mathbb{Q}$. Let us consider the group $C_p^-=C_p/C_p^+$. In this section, we give some more general results in the group $C_p^-=C_p/C_p^+$. Let us note $\mathbf{q}\simeq\mathbb{Z}[\zeta]$ when the ideal $\mathbf{q}$ is principal in C_p^-.

Theorem 16.7. *Let $d_1,d_2\in\mathbb{N}$ with $1\le d_1<d_2\le p-2$; then*

$$\prod_{i\in I(d_1)\cap I(d_2)}\sigma^i(\mathbf{q})\simeq\mathbb{Z}[\zeta].$$

Proof. The ideal $P=\prod_{i\in I(d_1)}\sigma^i(\mathbf{q})\times\prod_{i\in I(d_2)}\sigma^i(\mathbf{q})$ is principal. Let $J(d_1,d_2)=I(d_1)\cap I(d_2)$. Let $M(d_1,d_2)=(I(d_1)\cup I(d_2))-J(d_1,d_2)$. We get

$$P=\prod_{i\in J(d_1,d_2)}(\sigma^i(\mathbf{q}))^2\times\prod_{i\in M(d_1,d_2)}\sigma^i(\mathbf{s}).$$

If $i\in M(d_1,d_2)$ then:

- else $i\in I(d_1)$ and $i\notin I(d_2)$; in that case, from relation (154) p.164, there exists $\varepsilon_i\in\{-1,1\}$ with $1\le i+\varepsilon_i\frac{p-1}{2}\le p-1$ and $i+\varepsilon_i\frac{p-1}{2}\in I(d_2),\quad i+\varepsilon_i\frac{p-1}{2}\notin I(d_1)$, therefore $\{i,i+\varepsilon_i\frac{p-1}{2}\}\subset M(d_1,d_2)$.
- else $i\in I(d_2)$ and $i\notin I(d_1)$; in that case there exists $\varepsilon_i\in\{-1,1\}$ with $1\le i+\varepsilon_i\frac{p-1}{2}\le p-1$ and $i+\varepsilon_i\frac{p-1}{2}\in I(d_1),\quad i+\varepsilon_i\frac{p-1}{2}\notin I(d_2)$, therefore $\{i,i+\varepsilon_i\frac{p-1}{2}\}\subset M(d_1,d_2)$.

Therefore

$$P=\prod_{i\in J(d_1,d_2)}(\sigma^i(\mathbf{q}))^2\times\prod_{\{i,i+\varepsilon_i(p-1)/2\}\subset K(d_1,d_2)}\sigma^i(\mathbf{q})\times\overline{\sigma^i(\mathbf{q})}$$

because $\sigma^{i+\varepsilon_i(p-1)/2}(\mathbf{q})=\overline{\sigma^i(\mathbf{q})}$. Then we deduce that $P\cong\prod_{i\in J(d_1,d_2)}(\sigma^i(\mathbf{q}))^2$ in the class group C_p^- and finally that $\prod_{i\in J(d_1,d_2)}\sigma^i(\mathbf{q})^2$ is principal in C_p^-, which leads to the result. ☐

Lemma 16.8. ***** Let $k\in\mathbb{N},\quad 1\le k\le p-2$. Let $d_l\in\mathbb{N},\quad l=1,\dots,k,\quad 1\le d_1<d_2<\dots<d_k\le p-2$. Then*

$$\prod_{i\in I(d_1,\dots,d_k)}\sigma^i(\mathbf{q})\simeq\prod_{i\in J(d_1,\dots,d_k)}\sigma^i(\mathbf{q}).\tag{159}$$

Proof. Let any $i \in I(d_1, \dots, d_k)$. There exists $j_i \in \mathbb{N}, \quad 1 \le j_i \le k$, such that, with a certain reordering of $d_1, \dots, d_k$, and without loss of generality,

$$i \in I(d_1), \dots i \in I(d_{j_i}),$$
$$i \notin I(d_{j_i+1}), \dots i \notin I(d_k).$$

- Suppose at first that $j_i < k$: then there exists one and only one $\varepsilon_i \in \{-1, 1\}$ with $1 \le i + \varepsilon_i \frac{p-1}{2} \le p - 1$ and with $i + \varepsilon_i \frac{p-1}{2} \in I(d_{j_i+1})$. Therefore, $\{i, i + \varepsilon_i \frac{p-1}{2}\} \subset I(d_1, \dots, d_k)$. Therefore, the term $\sigma^i(\mathbf{q}) \times \sigma^{i+\varepsilon_i(p-1)/2}(\mathbf{q}) = \sigma^i(\mathbf{q}) \times \overline{\sigma^i(\mathbf{q})}$ which is principal in C_p^- can be omitted in the computation of class of $\prod_{i \in I(d_1, \dots, d_k)} \sigma^i(\mathbf{q})$ in C_p^-.
- Suppose then that $j_i = k$: it means that $i \in I(d_1), \dots, i \in I(d_k)$ and so $i \in J(d_1, \dots, d_k)$, which achieves the proof.

□

16.4 On p-rank of the matrix of Kummer's system

Let us consider $P_d = \prod_{i \in I_{u,d}} \sigma^i(\mathbf{s})$. With the language of representations of section 2 p.15, it means that, if $X \cong Cl(\mathbf{s})$, then we have the system of relations

$$P_i(X) = \sum_{i \in I(d)} X^i = 0, \quad d = 1, \dots, p-2.$$

This system can be reduced to the system

$$\begin{aligned} &P_i(X) = \sum_{i=1}^{(p-1)/2} \varepsilon_{i,d} X^i = 0, \quad d = 1, \dots, p-2, \\ &\varepsilon_{i,d} = 1 \Leftrightarrow i \in I(d), \\ &\varepsilon_{i,d} = -1 \Leftrightarrow i \pm (p-1)/2 \in I(d). \end{aligned}$$

A direct computation show that $\sum_{i=1}^{(p-1)/2} \varepsilon_{i,d} X^i$ is identically similar to $\sum_{i=1}^{(p-1)/2} \varepsilon_{i,p-1-d} X^i$. Observe also that $\sigma^{i+(p-1)/2}(\mathbf{s}) = \overline{\sigma^i(\mathbf{s})}$ and that $\sigma^i(\mathbf{s}) \times \overline{\sigma^i(\mathbf{s})}$ is principal in C_p^-. Therefore the Kummer's $p-2$ relations can *canonically* be reduced to a system of $\frac{p-1}{2}$ relations :

$$\begin{aligned} &P_i(X) = \sum_{i=1}^{(p-1)/2} \varepsilon_{i,d} X^i = 0, \quad d = 1, \dots, \frac{p-1}{2}, \\ &\varepsilon_{i,d} = 1 \Leftrightarrow (u_{(p-1)/2-i} + (d \times u_{(p-1)/2-i} \bmod p)) > p, \\ &\varepsilon_{i,d} = -1 \Leftrightarrow (u_{-i} + (d \times u_{-i} \bmod p)) > p. \end{aligned} \tag{160}$$

The square matrix $M_p = (\varepsilon_{i,d})_{1\leq d,i\leq (p-1)/2}$ is then well defined : we shall study this matrix carefully. First we give as an example from a MAPLE program the value of the matrix and of its determinant for $p = 13$.

$$M_p \equiv \begin{vmatrix} -1 & -1 & 1 & -1 & -1 & -1 \\ 1 & -1 & -1 & -1 & -1 & -1 \\ -1 & -1 & 1 & 1 & -1 & -1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & -1 & -1 & -1 \\ -1 & -1 & -1 & -1 & -1 & -1 \\ 1 & -1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & -1 \end{vmatrix} \mod p$$

From a MAPLE program, we have computed the p-rank of M_p for $2 < p < 200$. The results are given in the following table

p	k_p	p	k_p	p	k_p	p	k_p	p	k_p
3	1	5	2	7	3	11	5	13	6
17	8	19	9	23	11	29	14	31	15
37	**17**	41	20	43	21	47	23	53	26
59	**28**	61	30	**67**	**32**	71	35	73	36
79	39	83	41	89	44	97	48	**101**	**49**
103	**50**	107	53	109	54	113	56	127	63
131	**64**	137	68	139	69	**149**	**73**	151	75
157	**76**	163	81	167	83	173	86	179	89
181	90	191	95	193	96	197	98	199	99

All the p-rank $k_p < (p-1)/2$ bold printed correspond to **irregular** primes. In this table, the irregular prime all have rank $\frac{p-1}{2} - 1$ except the prime $p = 157$ with $k_p = \frac{p-1}{2} - 2$.Observe that these results are in accordance with table of relative class numbers in Washington [68], p 412.

We can now give, as an application to FLT, the following theorem:

Theorem 16.9. *A criterion on M_p for First case of FLT*

If the first case of FLT would fail for p, then the p-rank k_p of the matrix M_p should verify

$$k_p < \frac{p-1}{2} - \sqrt{p} - 1. \tag{161}$$

Proof. Suppose that $k_p > \frac{p-1}{2} - \sqrt{p} - 1$ and search for a contradiction: Let us consider the $\frac{p-1}{2}$ relations, with $X^i \cong Cl(\sigma^i(\mathbf{s})$,

$$\sum_{i\in I(d)} \varepsilon_{i,d} X^i = 0, \quad d = 1, \dots, p-2.$$

It would be possible to find, by elimination, a polynomial $\mathbf{P}_d(X)$ of degree $d < \sqrt{p}-1$ with $\mathbf{P}_d(X)=0$; from theorem 2.3 p.21 we should have $d \geq r_1$, degree of the representation $\rho_1 : G \to \mathbf{GL}(\mathbf{F}_p.V_1)$ and also degree of the minimal associate polynomial $P_{r_1}(X)$, because we should have $\mathbf{P}_d(X) = P_{r_1}(X) \times Q(X), \quad Q(X) \in \mathbf{F_p}[\mathbf{X}]$. But, from Eichler's, we deduce that $r_1 > \sqrt{p}-1$. $\square$

16.5 Generalizations of Kummer congruences - I

This subsection is in the Fermat's equation context.

- Let $q \in \mathbb{N}, \quad q \equiv 1 \bmod p$, be a prime.

  Let $\mathbf{q} \subset \mathbb{Z}[\zeta]$ be a prime ideal above q. Recall that the relation (2.5) p119 of [39] says that $\prod_{i\in I(d)} \sigma^i(\mathbf{q})$ is a principal integral ideal of $\mathbb{Z}[\zeta]$.

- Using this relation for all the prime ideals, all different of $\pi = (1-\zeta)\mathbb{Z}[\zeta]$, dividing $(x+\zeta y)$, We can generalize for the ideal $\mathbf{s}, \quad \mathbf{s}^p = (x+\zeta y)\mathbb{Z}[\zeta]$, (First and second case of Fermat equation) to,

  $$P_d = \prod_{i\in I(d)} \sigma_i(\mathbf{s}) \tag{162}$$

  is a principal ideal. All the results of the sections 8 p.76, 9 p.89 start from the existence of the principal ideal $\prod_{i=1}^{f} \sigma_i(\mathbf{s})^{l_i}$. The sketch of proof of this section of the article is exactly the same with, here, the principal ideal of the relation (162), $P_d = \prod_{i\in I(d)} \sigma_i(\mathbf{s})$. Using this equation and results of previous sections, we shall give several generalizations of Kummer congruences $\bmod p$.

Proposition 3. *Let $u \in \mathbb{N}$ be a primitive root $\bmod p$. Let $d \in \mathbb{N}, \quad 0 \leq d \leq p-2$. Then there exists $v \in \mathbb{N}, \quad 0 \leq v \leq p-1$ such that :*

$$-2v + \sum_{i\in I(d)} \frac{u_i}{(x+\zeta^{u_i}y)} + \sum_{i\in I(d)} \frac{u_i}{(x+\zeta^{-u_i}y)} \equiv 0 \ mod\ \pi^{p-1}. \tag{163}$$

Proof. From relation (162) p.170 we deduce, similarly to proposition 2 p.76, that

$$\prod_{i\in I(d)} (x+\zeta^{u_i}y) = \zeta^m \eta \gamma^p, \quad \eta \in \mathbb{Z}[\zeta+\zeta^{-1}]^*, \quad \gamma \in \mathbb{Z}[\zeta],$$

then, by conjugation,

$$\prod_{i\in I(d)} (x+\zeta^{-u_i}y) = \zeta^{-m} \eta \overline{\gamma^p}, \quad \eta \in \mathbb{Z}[\zeta+\zeta^{-1}]^*, \quad \overline{\gamma} \in \mathbb{Z}[\zeta]$$

hence

$$\zeta^{-m}\prod_{i\in I(d)}(x+\zeta^{u_i}y)\equiv\zeta^{m}\prod_{i\in I(u,d)}(x+\zeta^{-u_i}y) \bmod \pi^{p+1}.$$

Then, similarly to proposition 8.9 p.85, we deduce that:

$$(-m)\zeta^{-m-1}\prod_{i\in I(d)}(x+\zeta^{u_i}y)+\zeta^{-m}\prod_{i\in I(d)}(x+\zeta^{u_i}y)\sum_{i\in I(u,d)}\frac{u_i\zeta^{u_i-1}y}{(x+\zeta^{u_i}y)}\equiv$$

$$(m)\zeta^{m-1}\prod_{i\in I(d)}(x+\zeta^{-u_i}y)+\zeta^{m}\prod_{i\in I(d)}(x+\zeta^{-u_i}y)\sum_{i\in I(d)}\frac{(-u_i)\zeta^{-u_i-1}y}{(x+\zeta^{-u_i}y)} \bmod \pi^{p-1},$$

then, multiplying by ζ,

$$(-m)\zeta^{-m}\prod_{i\in I(d)}(x+\zeta^{u_i}y)+\zeta^{-m}\prod_{i\in I(d)}(x+\zeta^{u_i}y)\sum_{i\in I(d)}\frac{u_i\zeta^{u_i}y}{(x+\zeta^{u_i}y)}\equiv$$

$$(m)\zeta^{m}\prod_{i\in I(d)}(x+\zeta^{-u_i}y)+\zeta^{m}\prod_{i\in I(d)}(x+\zeta^{-u_i}y)\sum_{i\in I(d)}\frac{(-u_i)\zeta^{-u_i}y}{(x+\zeta^{-u_i}y)} \bmod \pi^{p-1},$$

so

$$(-m)+\sum_{i\in I(d)}\frac{u_i\zeta^{u_i}y}{(x+\zeta^{u_i}y)}\equiv(m)+\sum_{i\in I(d)}\frac{(-u_i)\zeta^{-u_i}y}{(x+\zeta^{-u_i}y)} \bmod \pi^{p-1},$$

also

$$(-2m)+\sum_{i\in I(d)}\frac{u_i\zeta^{u_i}y}{(x+\zeta^{u_i}y)}+\sum_{i\in I(d)}\frac{u_i\zeta^{-u_i}y}{(x+\zeta^{-u_i}y)}\equiv 0 \bmod \pi^{p-1},$$

hence

$$\begin{aligned}&-2m+2(\sum_{i\in I(d)}u_i)\frac{y}{(x+y)}\\&-x\times(\sum_{i\in I(d)}\frac{u_i}{(x+\zeta^{u_i}y)}+\sum_{i\in I(d)}\frac{u_i}{(x+\zeta^{-u_i}y)})\equiv 0 \bmod \pi^{p-1}.\end{aligned}$$

□

Theorem 16.10. **** Let $\phi_{2m+1}(T),\quad m=1,\dots,\frac{p-3}{2}$ be the odd Mirimanoff polynomials. Let $t\equiv-\frac{y}{x}$ mod p. Let r be the value defined in theorem (9.6). Let $C_M=\{m_1,m_2,\dots,m_{r-1}\}\subset\{1,2,\dots,\frac{p-3}{2}\}$ be the set such that $m\in C_M\Longleftrightarrow\phi_{2m+1}(t)\not\equiv 0$ mod p, see corollary 9.9 p.105. Let $u\in\mathbb{N}$ be any primitive root mod p. Let $d\in\mathbb{N},\quad 1\le d\le p-2$. Let $I(u,d)=\{i,\quad 1\le i\le p-1,\quad (u_{\nu-i}+u_{\nu-i+ind_u(d)})>p\}$.*

Then for all $m\in C_M$, we have the congruence :

$$\sum_{i\in I(d)}u_i^{2m+1}\equiv 0 \text{ mod } p.$$

Proof. From proposition 3 p.170 and similarly to theorem 9.1 p.89, we have for $1 \leq m \leq \frac{p-3}{2}$ the congruence $\phi_{2m+1}(t) \times \sum_{i \in I(d)} u_i^{2m+1} \equiv 0 \bmod p$. ☐

Corollary 16.11. *Let* $\mu \in \{3, 5, 7\}$. *Let* $d \in \mathbb{N}, \quad 1 \leq d \leq p - 2$.

Let $I(u, d) = \{i, \quad 1 \leq i \leq p - 1, \quad (u_{\nu-i} + u_{\nu-i+ind_u(d)}) > p\}$. *Then, for each primitive root u mod p, we have*

$$\sum_{i \in I(d)} u_i^{\mu} \equiv 0 \ mod\ p.$$

Proof. From [39], relation (1.12) p143, we get

$$\phi_{2m+1}(t) \equiv -(1 - t)^{p-1-2m} \times P_{2m+1}(-t) \bmod p.$$

where $P_{2m+1}(T)$ is the Kummer polynomial corresponding to the Mirimanoff polynomial $\phi_{2m+1}(T)$. From [39] p125 and p 140, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &P_3(-t) = -t(1 + t), \\ &P_5(-t) = -t(1 + t)(1 + 10t + t^2), \\ &P_7(-t) = -t(1 + t)(1 + 56t + 246t^2 + 56t^3 + t^4). \end{aligned}$$

Let $G = \{-\frac{x}{y}, -\frac{y}{x}, -\frac{x}{z}, -\frac{z}{x}, -\frac{x}{z}, -\frac{y}{z}, \frac{z}{y}\} \bmod p$. It is possible to prove by direct computation that:

- $P_3(-t) \equiv 0 \bmod p$ is not simultaneously possible for all $t \in G$,
- $P_5(-t) \equiv 0 \bmod p$ is not simultaneously possible for all $t \in G$,
- $P_7(-t) \equiv 0 \bmod p$ is not simultaneously possible for all $t \in G$.

(see [39] p 140, (1A)). Then , this corollary results immediatly from theorem 16.10 p.171. ☐

Remark: for $\mu > 3$, the proof use two or three of the Barlow-Abel relations

$$\frac{x^p + y^p}{x + y} = t_1^p, \quad \frac{y^p + z^p}{x + y} = r_1^p, \quad \frac{z^p + x^p}{x + y} = s_1^p$$

and then we cannot apply directly this result to Generalized Fermat-Wiles equation, see section 18 p.193.

Corollary 16.12. *Let* $\mu \in \{3, 5, 7\}$.

If p does not divide the sum

$$S = \sum_{j \in [\frac{p}{3}, \frac{p}{2}] \cup [\frac{2p}{3}, p-1]} \frac{1}{j^{\mu}},$$

then the First case of Fermat's Last Theorem holds for the exponent p.

Proof.

- Let $u^{ind_u(2)} \equiv 2 \mod p$. We have

  $$I(d) = \{i, \quad 0 \le i \le p-2, \quad (u_{\nu-i} + (2u_{\nu-i} \bmod p)) > p\}.$$

  Therefore, We have

  $$K(d) = \{k, \quad 1 \le k \le p-1, \quad (u_{\nu+k} + (2u_{\nu+k} \bmod p)) > p\}.$$

- If $u_{\nu+k} < \frac{p}{2}$ then $(2u_{\nu+k} \bmod p) = 2u_{\nu+k}$ leads to $u_{\nu+k} > \frac{p}{3}$, hence $\frac{p}{3} < j = u_{\nu+k} < \frac{p}{2}$.
- If $u_{\nu+k} > \frac{p}{2}$ then $(2u_{\nu+k} \bmod p) = 2u_{\nu+k} - p$ leads to $u_{\nu+k} > \frac{2p}{3}$ then to $\frac{2p}{3} < j = u_{\nu+k} \le p-1$.
- But $u_i^\mu \equiv u^{i\mu} \equiv (u^{-1})^{-i\mu} \equiv (u^{-i})^{-\mu}$ so $u_i^\mu \equiv -(u_{\nu-i})^{-\mu} \equiv -j^{-\mu} \mod p$, because $u^\nu \equiv -1 \mod p$.
- the result is then an immediate consequence of the previous proposition 16.11 p.172.

□

Corollary 16.13. *Let $\mu \in \{3, 5, 7\}$. If p does not divide the sum*

$$S = \sum_{j \in [\frac{p}{4}, \frac{p}{3}] \cup [\frac{2p}{4}, \frac{2p}{3}] \cup [\frac{3p}{4}, p-1]} \frac{1}{j^\mu},$$

then the First case of Fermat's Last Theorem holds for the exponent p.

Proof.

- Let $d = 3$. We have $I(d) = \{i, \quad 0 \le i \le p-2, \quad (u_{\nu-i} + (3u_{\nu-i} \bmod p)) > p\}$.
- If $u_{\nu-i} < \frac{p}{3}$ then $(3u_{\nu-i} \bmod p) = 3u_{\nu-i}$ so $u_{\nu-i} > \frac{p}{4}$, hence $\frac{p}{4} < j = u_{\nu-i} < \frac{p}{3}$.
- If $u_{\nu-i} < \frac{2p}{3}$ and $u_{\nu-i} > \frac{p}{3}$ then $(3u_{\nu-i} \bmod p) = 3u_{\nu-i} - p$ so $u_{\nu-i} > \frac{2p}{4}$, hence $\frac{2p}{4} < j = u_{\nu-i} < \frac{2p}{3}$.
- If $u_{\nu-i} > \frac{2p}{3}$ then $3u_{\nu-i} \bmod p = 3u_{\nu-i} - 2p$ so $u_{\nu-i} > \frac{3p}{4}$, hence $\frac{3p}{4} < j = u_{\nu-i} \le p-1$.
- But $u_i^\mu \equiv u^{i\mu} \equiv (u^{-1})^{-i\mu} \equiv (u^{-i})^{-\mu}$ so $u_i^\mu \equiv -(u_{\nu-i})^{-\mu} \equiv -j^{-\mu} \bmod p$ because $u^\nu \equiv -1 \bmod p$.

- the result is then an immediate consequence of the proposition 16.11 p.172.

□

Corollary 16.14. *Let* $\mu \in \{3, 5, 7\}$. *If* p *does not divide the sum* $\sum_{j\in[1,\frac{p}{4}]}\frac{1}{j^\mu}$ *then the first case of Fermat's Last Theorem holds for the exponent* p.

Proof. If the First case of Fermat fails, then, from the two previous propositions by addition of congruences,

$$\sum_{j>p/3}^{j<p/2} j^{-\mu} + \sum_{j>2p/3}^{j=p-1} j^{-\mu} + \sum_{j>p/4}^{j<p/3} j^{-\mu} + \sum_{j>p/2}^{j<2p/3} j^{-\mu} + \sum_{j>3p/4}^{j=p-1} j^{-\mu} \equiv 0 \bmod p,$$

so, by permutation of the sums,

$$\sum_{j>p/4}^{j<p/3} j^{-\mu} + \sum_{j>p/3}^{j<p/2} j^{-\mu} + \sum_{j>p/2}^{j<2p/3} j^{-\mu} + \sum_{j>2p/3}^{j=p-1} j^{-\mu} + \sum_{j>3p/4}^{j=p-1} j^{-\mu} \equiv 0 \bmod p,$$

so grouping sums,

$$\sum_{j>p/4}^{j=p-1} j^{-\mu} + \sum_{j>3p/4}^{j=p-1} j^{-\mu} \equiv 0 \bmod p,$$

also, noticing that $\sum_{j=1}^{p-1} j^{-\mu} \equiv 0 \bmod p$,

$$\sum_{j>3p/4}^{j=p-1} j^{-\mu} - \sum_{j=1}^{j<p/4} j^{-\mu} \equiv 0 \bmod p,$$

and

$$\sum_{j=1}^{j<p/4} j^{-\mu} \equiv 0 \bmod p.$$

which completes the proof. □

Corollary 16.15. ***** $3(p-2)$ *congruences* $\bmod p$.

Let $\mu \in \{3, 5, 7\}$. *Let* $d \in \mathbb{N}$, $\quad 1 \le d \le p-2$. *If* p *does not divide the sum*

$$S = \sum_{j\in\cup_{l=1}^{d}[\frac{lp}{d+1},\frac{lp}{d}[} \frac{1}{j^\mu}$$

then the first case of Fermat's Last Theorem holds for the exponent p.

Proof. Same proof as 16.12 p.172. $\square$

Remarks :

- These results generalize the Cauchy congruence $\sum_{j=1}^{(p-1)/2} \frac{1}{j^3} \equiv 0 \bmod p$ (see for instance [4] or [39] (4A) p 120) and the other summation criteria of the bibliography (see the survey in section17 p.183). Corollary (16.15) p.174 generalizes Cauchy congruences depending only on p to $3(p-2)$ explicit congruences depending only on p for $k = 1, \dots, p-2$.

- With the meaning of r and C_M given in theorem 16.10 p.171, we can generalize these congruences involving $\sum \frac{1}{j^\mu}$ for $\mu \in \{3, 5, 7\}$ to all sums of the form $\sum_j \frac{1}{j^{2m+1}}$ for $m \in C_M$.

  In this direction, we obtain the result :

  Let $m \in C_M = \{m \mid \phi_{2m+1}(t) \not\equiv 0 \bmod p\}$. Let $d \in \mathbb{N}, \quad 1 \leq d \leq p-2$. If p does not divide the sum $\sum_{l=1}^{d} \sum_{j>(lp)/(d+1)}^{j<(lp)/d} \frac{1}{j^{2m+1}}$ then the first case of Fermat's Last Theorem holds for the exponent p. The previous results being a particular case of this theorem.

- Note that our proof does not use the Bernoulli numbers B_k. It is also possible to obtain a proof connected to Bernoulli Numbers : From proposition (5B) p 108 in [39], derived of a result of Vandiver [66] resting on class field theory, we have for $d \in \mathbb{N}, \quad d = 2, \dots, p-2$, the congruences:

$$(1 - d^{-2m})B_{p-2m-1} \equiv (p - 2m - 1)d^{-2m-1} \sum_{l=1}^{d-1} \sum_{1 \leq j < \frac{lp}{d}} \frac{1}{j^{2m+1}} \bmod p.$$

  Then, we get in the same way, with $d+1$ in place of d, the second relations

$$(1-(d+1)^{-2m})B_{p-2m-1} \equiv (p-2m-1)(d+1)^{-2m-1} \sum_{l=1}^{d} \sum_{1 \leq j < \frac{lp}{(d+1)}} \frac{1}{j^{2m+1}} \bmod p.$$

  From Ribenboim [39], (4E) p 125 and (1A) p 140, we have $B_{p-3} \equiv B_{p-5} \equiv B_{p-7} \bmod p$. Then, by difference of the two previous congruences for $m = 1, m = 2, m = 3$, we get the results of the corollary 16.15 p.174.

From remark and corollary 9.12 p.109 , we state the theorem :

Theorem 16.16. ***

Let r_p be the $p-$rank of the class group of $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$. Let $C_M = \{m \mid 1 \leq m \leq \frac{p-3}{2}, \quad \phi_{2m+1}(t) \not\equiv 0 \bmod p\}$. If the first case of FLT fails for p then

- *$3 \leq Card(C_M) \leq r_p$ and $\{1,2,3\} \subset C_M$.*
- *$Card(C_M) \times (p-2)$ congruences :*

  For every $m \in C_M$ and every $d \in \mathbb{N}, \quad 1 \leq d \leq p-2$,

$$\sum_{j \in \cup_{l=1}^{d} [\frac{lp}{d+1}, \frac{lp}{d}[} \frac{1}{j^{2m+1}} \equiv 0 \ mod \ p$$

Corollary 16.17. *$[Log(p)^{1/3}](p-2)$ congruences $mod\ p$*

Let $n_0 = (45!)^{88}$. Let $m \in \mathbb{N}, \quad m = 1, \dots, [Log(p)^{1/3}]$. Let $d \in \mathbb{N}, \quad 1 \leq d \leq p-2$. If p does not divide the sum

$$S = \sum_{j \in \cup_{l=1}^{d} [\frac{lp}{d+1}, \frac{lp}{d}[} \frac{1}{j^{2m+1}}$$

then the first case of Fermat's Last Theorem holds for the exponent p.

Proof. Is an immediate consequence of [24], of the Vandiver congruences [66] and of a previous remark between our results and Vandiver [66]. $\square$

16.6 Bernoulli Numbers and sums $\sum_{j \in \cup_{l=1}^{d} [\frac{lp}{d+1}, \frac{lp}{d}[} \frac{1}{j^{2m+1}}$.

This subsection deals with a connection, in a general context independant of FLT, between even Bernoulli numbers B_{p-1-2m} and sum congruences $\sum_{j \in \cup_{l=1}^{d} [\frac{lp}{d+1}, \frac{lp}{d}]} \frac{1}{j^{2m+1}}$ for $d = 1, \dots, p-2$.

Let $S(d-1) = \sum_{l=1}^{d-1} \sum_{1 \leq j < lp/d} \frac{1}{j^{2m+1}}$ mod p. From Vandiver in Ribenboim [39], (5B) p 108, we get for $m = 1, \dots, \frac{p-3}{2}$

$$S(d-1) \equiv \frac{d \times (d^{2m} - 1) \times B_{p-1-2m}}{p-1-2m} \text{ mod } p,$$
$$S(d) \equiv \frac{(d+1) \times ((d+1)^{2m} - 1) \times B_{p-1-2m}}{p-1-2m} \text{ mod } p.$$

Then we have

$$S(d) \equiv \sum_{l=1}^{d-1} \sum_{1 \leq j < lp/(d+1)} \frac{1}{j^{2m+1}} + \sum_{1 \leq j < dp/(d+1)} \frac{1}{j^{2m+1}} \text{ mod } p.$$

This leads to

$$S(d) \equiv \sum_{l=1}^{d-1} (\sum_{1 \leq j < lp/d} \frac{1}{j^{2m+1}} - \sum_{j > lp/(d+1)}^{j < lp/d} \frac{1}{j^{2m+1}}) + \sum_{1 \leq j < dp/(d+1)} \frac{1}{j^{2m+1}} \text{ mod } p,$$

and so

$$S(d) \equiv S(d-1) - \sum_{l=1}^{d-1} \sum_{j>lp/(d+1)}^{j<lp/d} \frac{1}{j^{2m+1}} + \sum_{1 \le j < dp/(d+1)} \frac{1}{j^{2m+1}} \bmod p,$$

also

$$S(d) \equiv S(d-1) - \sum_{l=1}^{d} \sum_{j>lp/(d+1)}^{j<lp/d} \frac{1}{j^{2m+1}}$$
$$+ \sum_{dp/(d+1)<j<p} \frac{1}{j^{2m+1}} + \sum_{1 \le j < dp/(d+1)} \frac{1}{j^{2m+1}} \bmod p,$$

also

$$S(d) \equiv S(d-1) - \sum_{l=1}^{d} \sum_{j>lp/(d+1)}^{j<lp/d} \frac{1}{j^{2m+1}}$$
$$+ \sum_{1 \le j < p} \frac{1}{j^{2m+1}} \bmod p,$$

and finally

$$S(d) \equiv S(d-1) - \sum_{l=1}^{d} \sum_{lp/(d+1)<j}^{j<lp/d} \frac{1}{j^{2m+1}} \bmod p.$$

Then with previous relations obtained with Bernoulli numbers we get

Theorem 16.18. *For $d \in \mathbb{N}$, $\quad 1 \le d \le p-2$ and for $m = 1, \dots, \frac{p-3}{2}$, we have for the even Bernoulli Numbers*

$$\sum_{j \in \cup_{l=1}^{d} [\frac{lp}{d+1}, \frac{lp}{d}[} \frac{1}{j^{2m+1}} \equiv \frac{d(d^{2m}-1) - (d+1)((d+1)^{2m}-1)}{p-1-2m} \times B_{p-1-2m} \ mod\ p \tag{164}$$

Remarks:

- Observe that these general $p-2$ congruences without any connection with FLT are a tool to test $B_{p-1-2m} \equiv 0 \bmod p$.
- We verified numerically this congruence with a Maple Program, which is an indirect insurance that our previous results are correct.

- Observe that else $\frac{1}{j^{2m+1}}$ else $\frac{1}{(p-j)^{2m+1}}$ intervenes in the sum in the first member of the relation (164) p.177 which corresponds to $i+\frac{p-1}{2}\notin I(u,d)$: this shows that the class of the ideal $\sigma^i(\mathbf{s})\sigma^{i+(p-1)/2}(s)=\sigma^i(\mathbf{s})\overline{\sigma^i(s)}$ of $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta+\zeta^{-1})$ does not intervenes in this computation of B_{p-1-2m} and that $B_{p-1-2m}\equiv 0 \bmod p$ caracterizes h^- and finally that p irregular implies that $p|h^-$.

These congruences can be explicitly written in the form

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\gamma_{1,2}\frac{1}{2^{2m+1}}+\cdots+\gamma_{1,j}\frac{1}{j^{2m+1}}+\cdots+\gamma_{1,p-1}\frac{1}{(p-1)^{2m+1}}\equiv 0 \bmod p,\\
&\vdots\\
&\gamma_{d,2}\frac{1}{2^{2m+1}}+\cdots+\gamma_{d,j}\frac{1}{j^{2m+1}}+\cdots+\gamma_{d,p-1}\frac{1}{(p-1)^{2m+1}}\equiv 0 \bmod p,\\
&\vdots\\
&\gamma_{p-2,2}\frac{1}{2^{2m+1}}+\cdots+\gamma_{p-2,j}\frac{1}{j^{2m+1}}+\cdots+\gamma_{p-2,p-1}\frac{1}{(p-1)^{2m+1}}\equiv 0 \bmod p,\\
&\gamma_{d,j}\in\{0,1\},\quad d=1,\dots,p-2,\quad j=2,\dots,p-1,\\
&\gamma_{d,j}=1 \text{ if } \exists l\in\mathbb{N},\quad \frac{lp}{(d+1)}<j<\frac{lp}{d},\\
&\gamma_{d,j}=0 \text{ if } \nexists l\in\mathbb{N},\quad \frac{lp}{(d+1)}<j<\frac{lp}{d}.
\end{aligned}
\tag{165}
$$

We have the property

$$
Card\{\gamma_{d,j}\quad|\quad j=2,\dots,p-1,\quad \gamma_{d,j}\neq 0\}=\frac{p-1}{2},
$$

because it is not possible to have simultaneously

$$
\frac{l_1p}{(d+1)}<j<\frac{l_1p}{d},\quad \frac{l_2p}{(d+1)}<p-j<\frac{l_2p}{d};
$$

If not we should have $\frac{(l_1+l_2)p}{d+1}<p<\frac{(l_1+l_2)p}{d}$ and so $\frac{l_1+l_2}{d+1}<1<\frac{l_1+l_2}{d}$ so $l_1+l_2\leq d$ and $(d+1)\leq l_1+l_2$ contradiction. Then observing that $\frac{1}{j^{2m+1}}\equiv j^{p-1-(2m+1)}\equiv -(p-j)^{p-1-(2m+1)}\equiv -\frac{1}{(p-j)^{2m+1}} \bmod p$, from linear system (165) p.178 we get the reduced system

(166)

$$\delta_{1,1}\frac{1}{1^{2m+1}}+\cdots+\delta_{1,j}\frac{1}{j^{2m+1}}+\cdots+\delta_{1,(p-1)/2}\frac{1}{((p-1)/2)^{2m+1}}\equiv 0 \bmod p,$$

$$\vdots$$

$$\delta_{d,1}\frac{1}{1^{2m+1}}+\cdots+\delta_{d,j}\frac{1}{j^{2m+1}}+\cdots+\delta_{d,(p-1)/2}\frac{1}{((p-1)/2)^{2m+1}}\equiv 0 \bmod p,$$

$$\vdots$$

$$\delta_{(p-1)/2,1}\frac{1}{2^{2m+1}}+\cdots+\delta_{(p-1)/2,j}\frac{1}{j^{2m+1}}+\cdots+\delta_{(p-1)/2,(p-1)/2}\frac{1}{((p-1)/2^{2m+1}}\equiv 0 \bmod p,$$

$$\delta_{d,j}\in\{-1,1\},\quad d=1,\dots,(p-1)/2,\quad j=1,\dots,(p-1)/2,$$

$$\delta_{d,j}=1 \text{ i}f\ \exists l\in\mathbb{N},\quad \frac{lp}{(d+1)}<j<\frac{lp}{d},$$

$$\delta_{d,j}=-1 \text{ i}f\ \ \nexists l\in\mathbb{N},\quad \frac{lp}{(d+1)}<j<\frac{lp}{d}.$$

If the prime p is irregular then the determinant $\Delta=|\delta_{d,j}|,\quad d=1,\dots,\frac{p-1}{2},\quad j=1,\dots,\frac{p-1}{2}$ verifies $\Delta\equiv 0 \bmod p$. Then let i_p be the index of irregularity of the prime p, (the number of Bernoulli numbers $B_{p-1-2m}\equiv 0 \bmod p,\quad m=1,\dots,\frac{p-3}{2}$) then we get the theorem

Theorem 16.19. *Let Δ_p be the determinant*

$$\begin{aligned}
&\Delta_p=|\delta_{d,j}|,\quad d=1,\dots,\frac{(p-1}{2},\quad j=1,\dots,\frac{p-1}{2},\\
&\delta_{d,j}\in\{-1,1\},\quad d=1,\dots,(p-1)/2,\quad j=1,\dots,(p-1)/2,\\
&\delta_{d,j}=1\ if\ \exists l\in\mathbb{N},\quad \frac{lp}{(d+1)}<j<\frac{lp}{d},\\
&\delta_{d,j}=-1\ if\ \ \nexists l\in\mathbb{N},\quad \frac{lp}{(d+1)}<j<\frac{lp}{d}.
\end{aligned}\tag{167}$$

If the prime p has index of irregularity $i_p\geq 1$ then all the minor determinant M of Δ_p of rank $r_M\geq\frac{p+1}{2}-i_p$ are divisible by p.

$$\Delta$$

Proof. To each Bernoulli Number $B_{p-1-2m}\equiv 0 \bmod p$ corresponds a system of congruences (166) p.179 with $\frac{1}{i^{2m+1}},\quad i=1,\dots,\frac{p-1}{2}$; two such systems are not equivalent. □

As an example we have, for $p = 17$, irregular prime, from an easy MAPLE computation:

$$\Delta_{17} = \begin{vmatrix} -1 & -1 & -1 & -1 & -1 & -1 & -1 & -1 \\ -1 & -1 & -1 & -1 & -1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ -1 & -1 & -1 & -1 & 1 & -1 & -1 & -1 \\ -1 & -1 & -1 & 1 & -1 & -1 & 1 & 1 \\ -1 & -1 & 1 & -1 & -1 & 1 & -1 & -1 \\ -1 & -1 & -1 & -1 & 1 & -1 & -1 & 1 \\ -1 & -1 & -1 & -1 & -1 & -1 & 1 & -1 \\ -1 & 1 & -1 & 1 & -1 & 1 & -1 & 1 \end{vmatrix} \equiv 9 \text{ mod } 17$$

The same computation for $p = 37$, first irregular prime, show that $\Delta_{37} \equiv 0$ mod 37.

16.7 Generalizations of Kummer congruences - II

We have seen that $P_1 = \prod_{i \in I(d_1)} (x + \zeta^{u_i} y)\mathbb{Z}[\zeta]$ is a principal ideal. For another value $d_2 \neq d_1$, we have also $P_2 = \prod_{i \in I(d_2)} (x + \zeta^{u_i} y)\mathbb{Z}[\zeta]$ is a principal ideal. Here, we use simultaneously these two properties. From [39] p121 we have $Card(I(d_1)) = Card(I(d_2)) = \frac{p-1}{2}$.

Proposition 4. *Let $u \in \mathbb{N}$ be a primitive root mod p. Let $d_1, d_2 \in \mathbb{N}$, $0 \leq d_1 < d_2 \leq p - 2$.*

Let $I(d_1) = \{i, \quad 1 \leq i \leq p-1, \quad (u_{\nu-i} + u_{\nu-i+ind_u(d_1)}) > p\}$.

Let $I(d_2) = \{i, \quad 1 \leq i \leq p-1, \quad (u_{\nu-i} + u_{\nu-i+ind_u(d_2)}) > p\}$.

Then, there exists $m \in \mathbb{N}$, $0 \leq m \leq p - 1$ such that :

$$-2m + \sum_{i \in I(d_1) \cap I(d_2)} \frac{u_i}{(x + \zeta^{u_i} y)} + \sum_{i \in I(d_1) \cap I(d_2)} \frac{u_i}{(x + \zeta^{-u_i} y)} \equiv 0 \text{ } mod \text{ } \pi^{p-1}. \tag{168}$$

Proof. Let $P_1 = \prod_{i \in I(d_1)} (x + \zeta^{u_i} y)$. Let $P_2 = \prod_{i \in I(d_2)} (x + \zeta^{u_i} y)$. We have $P_1 \times P_2 = \zeta^{m_1 + m_2} \eta_1 \eta_2 \gamma_1^p \gamma_2^p$ where $m_1, m_2 \in \mathbb{N}$, $0 \leq m_1 \leq p - 1$, $0 \leq m_2 \leq p - 1$, where $\eta_1, \eta_2 \in \mathbb{Z}[\zeta + \zeta^{-1}]^*$, where $\gamma_1, \gamma_2 \in \mathbb{Z}[\zeta]$. Then we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & P_1 P_2 = \zeta^m \eta \gamma^p, \\ & m \in \mathbb{N}, \quad 0 \leq m \leq p - 1, \quad \eta \in \mathbb{Z}[\zeta + \zeta^{-1}]^*, \quad \gamma \in \mathbb{Z}[\zeta]. \end{aligned}$$

Let $J(d_1, d_2) = (I(d_1) \cup I(d_2)) - (I(d_1) \cap I(d_2))$. We have

$$P_1 P_2 = \prod_{i \in I(d_1) \cap I(d_2)} (x + \zeta^{u_i} y)^2 \prod_{i \in J(d_1, d_2)} (x + \zeta^{u_i} y)(x + \zeta^{-u_i} y)$$

because, from [39] p 121, if $i \in I(d_1)$ and $i \notin I(d_2)$ then $i + \frac{p-1}{2} \bmod p \in I(d_2)$ and $u_{i+(p-1)/2} \equiv -u_i \bmod p$. Then,

$$\zeta^{-m} \prod_{i \in I(d_1) \cap I(d_2)} (x + \zeta^{u_i} y)^2 \prod_{i \in J(d_1,d_2)} (x + \zeta^{u_i} y)(x + \zeta^{-u_i} y) \equiv$$

$$\zeta^{m} \prod_{i \in I(d_1) \cap I(u,d_2)} (x + \zeta^{-u_i} y)^2 \prod_{i \in J(d_1,d_2)} (x + \zeta^{u_i} y)(x + \zeta^{-u_i} y) \bmod \pi^{p+1},$$

so

$$\zeta^{-m} \prod_{i \in I(d_1) \cap I(d_2)} (x + \zeta^{u_i} y)^2 \equiv \zeta^{m} \prod_{i \in I(d_1) \cap I(d_2)} (x + \zeta^{-u_i} y)^2 \bmod \pi^{p+1},$$

also

$$\zeta^{-2m} \prod_{i \in I(d_1) \cap I(d_2)} (x + \zeta^{u_i} y)^2 \equiv \prod_{i \in I(d_1) \cap I(d_2)} (x + \zeta^{-u_i} y)^2 \bmod \pi^{p+1},$$

$$\zeta^{-2m(p+1)/2} \prod_{i \in I(d_1) \cap I(d_2)} (x + \zeta^{u_i} y)^{2(p+1)/2} \equiv \prod_{i \in I(d_1) \cap I(d_2)} (x + \zeta^{-u_i} y)^{2(p+1)/2} \bmod \pi^{p+1},$$

hence

$$\zeta^{-m} \prod_{i \in I(d_1) \cap I(d_2)} (x + \zeta^{u_i} y) \equiv \prod_{i \in I(d_1) \cap I(d_2)} (x + \zeta^{-u_i} y) \bmod \pi^{p+1},$$

because $(x + \zeta^{u_i} y)^p \equiv (x + \zeta^{-u_i} y)^p \bmod \pi^{p+1}$. Then, the end of the proof is the same than the proof of the theorem 3 p.170. □

Corollary 16.20. $\frac{3(p-2)(p-3)}{2}$ *congruences mod p.*
Let $\mu \in \{3,5,7\}$. *Let* $d_1, d_2 \in \mathbb{N}, \quad 1 \le d_1 < d_2 \le p-2$.
Let $I(d_1) = \{i, \quad 1 \le i \le p-1, \quad (u_{\nu-i} + u_{\nu-i+ind_u(d_1)}) > p\}$.
Let $I(d_2) = \{i, \quad 1 \le i \le p-1, \quad (u_{\nu-i} + u_{\nu-i+ind_u(d_2)}) > p\}$.
Then, for each primitive root u mod p, we have $\sum_{i \in I(d_1) \cap I(d_2)} u_i^{\mu} \equiv 0 \bmod p$.

Proof. Proof similar to corollary 16.11 p.172. □

Theorem 16.21. $\frac{3(p-2)(p-3)}{2}$ *congruences mod p.*
Let $\mu \in \{3,5,7\}$. *Let* $d_1, d_2 \in \mathbb{N}, \quad 1 \le d_1 < d_2 \le p-2$. *If p does not divide the sum*

$$S = \sum_{l=1}^{d_1} \sum_{m=1}^{d_2} \sum_{j \in [\frac{lp}{d_1+1}, \frac{lp}{d_1}[\cap [\frac{mp}{d_2+1}, \frac{mp}{d_2}[} \frac{1}{j^{\mu}},$$

$$S = \sum_{j \in \cup_{l=1}^{d_1} \cup_{m=1}^{d_2} ([\frac{lp}{d_1+1}, \frac{lp}{d_1}[\cap [\frac{mp}{d_2+1}, \frac{mp}{d_2}[\ )} \frac{1}{j^{\mu}}.$$

then the first case of Fermat's Last Theorem holds for the exponent p.

Proof.

- Observe at first that the two forms of S are equivalent because $l_1 \neq l_2 \Rightarrow [\frac{l_1 p}{d_1+1}, \frac{l_1 p}{d_1}] \cap [\frac{l_2 p}{d_1+1}, \frac{l_2 p}{d_1}] = \emptyset$; therefore
$$([\frac{l_1 p}{d_1+1}, \frac{l_1 p}{d_1}] \cup [\frac{m_1 p}{d_2+1}, \frac{m_1 p}{d_2}]) \cap ([\frac{l_2 p}{d_1+1}, \frac{l_2 p}{d_1}] \cup [\frac{m_2 p}{d_2+1}, \frac{m_2 p}{d_2}]) \neq \emptyset$$
implies that $l_1 = l_2$ and $m_1 = m_2$.

- From corollary 16.20 p.181, similarly to corollary 16.11 p.172, we have
$$\sum_{i \in I(d_1) \cap I(d_2)} u_i^{\mu} \equiv 0 \text{ mod } p.$$
Then the result is similar to corollary 16.15 p.174.

□

Corollary 16.22. $3(p-2)$ *congruences* $\;$ *mod p.*
Let $\mu \in \{3, 5, 7\}$. *Let* $d \in \mathbb{N}$, $\quad 1 \leq d \leq p-2$. *Then, we have* $\sum_{j>p/2}^{p-1} \sum_{m=1}^{d} \sum_{j \in [\frac{mp}{(d+1)}, \frac{mp}{d}[} \frac{1}{j^{\mu}} \equiv 0$ *mod p.*

Proof. Immediate consequence of theorem 16.21 p.181 with $d_1 = 1$ and $d_2 = d$. □

16.8 Generalization to exponential congruences $f(p,t) \equiv 0$ mod p.

All the results of this section can be generalized *mutatis mutandis* to exponential congruences on p and $t \equiv -\frac{y}{x}$ mod p: we give, as **an** example the generalization of Cauchy criterion $\sum_{j=(p+1)/2}^{p-1} \frac{1}{j^3} \equiv 0$ mod p.

Theorem 16.23. $p-1$ *congruences, generalization of Cauchy criterion to exponential congruences.*
For $k = 1, \dots, p-1$
$$\sum_{j=(p+1)/2}^{p-1} \frac{1}{j^3} \times (t^{(k \times j^3 \ mod \ p)} + t^{(p - k \times j^3 \ mod \ p)}) \equiv 0 \ mod \ p.$$

Proof. Apply theorem 12.3 p.126 to the set
$$I_f = I(d) = \{u_i = \frac{1}{j^3} \text{ mod } p \quad | \quad j = \frac{p-1}{2}, \dots, p-1\}.$$

□

17 FLT first case: A comparative survey with bibliography

This table locate our results in the context of a survey of some significant necessary conditions on x, y, p or on p for the first case of Fermat's Last Theorem seen in the literature. Here, we recall some notations used in this table :

- Let $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$; recall the classic notations
    - $[a, b] = \{\alpha \quad | \quad \alpha \in \mathbb{R}, \quad a \leq \alpha \leq b\}$,
    - $[a, b[= \{\alpha \quad | \quad \alpha \in \mathbb{R}, \quad a \leq \alpha < b\}$.
- $p \in \mathbb{N}, \quad p > 5$ prime.
- $p-$cyclotomic number field $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$.
- $\mathbb{Z}[\zeta]$, ring of integers of $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$.
- u is a primitive root $\mod p$. For $i \in \mathbb{N}, \quad u_i \equiv u^i \mod p$ with $1 \leq u_i \leq p-1$; for $i < 0$, it is to be understood as: u_i is defined by $u_i \times u_{-i} \equiv 1 \mod p$ and $1 \leq u_i \leq p-1$.
- $h = p^{e_p} \times h_2, \quad e_p \in \mathbb{N}, \quad h_2 \not\equiv 0 \mod p$, class number of $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$, where $e_p < p-2$, from theorem (7.2).
- $h = h^* \times h^+$, where h^* is the first factor of the class number.
- r_p, $p-$rank of the class group of the cyclotomic number field $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$.
- $x^p + y^p + z^p = 0, \quad x, y, z \in \mathbb{Z} - \{0\}$ coprime by pair: Fermat equation.
- $xyz \not\equiv 0 \mod p$: First case.
- $t \in \mathbb{N}, \quad t \equiv -\frac{x}{y} \mod p$.
- $\phi_{2m+1}(T) = 1^{2m}T + 2^{2m}T^2 + 3^{2m}T^3 + \cdots + (p-1)^{2m}T^{p-1}$, odd Mirimanoff polynomial of the indeterminate T, for $m = 1, \ldots, \frac{p-3}{2}$.
- $P_{2m+1}(T)$: explicitly computable Kummer's polynomials : $P_1(T) = T, \quad P_3(T) = T(1-T), \quad P_5(T) = T(1-T)(1-10T+T^2), \ldots$.
- $B_{p-1-2m}, \quad m \in \mathbb{N}, \quad$ even Bernoulli number for $m = 1, \ldots, \frac{p-3}{2}$.
- $i_p = Card\{1 \leq m \leq \frac{p-3}{2} \quad | \quad B_{p-1-2m} \equiv 0 \mod p\}$, index of irregularity of p.

- **gfw** : This mention joined to the formulation of a criterion on the following table means that the generalization of Fermat equation

  $$\begin{aligned} & x^p + y^p + c \times z^p = 0, \\ & c \in \mathbb{Z} - \{0\}, \\ & x \times y \times z \times c \not\equiv 0 \bmod p, \\ & x - y \not\equiv 0 \bmod p^2, \end{aligned}$$

  where the prime factors c_i of c verify $c_i \not\equiv 1 \bmod p$, as explained in section 18 p.193, can be applied to this criterion.

(1/8) If the first case of Fermat's Last Theorem would fail for p then:

Condition	*Author*	*date*	*Reference*
gfw $\sum_{j=1}^{(p-1)/2} \frac{1}{j^3} \equiv 0 \bmod p$.	Cauchy	1847	[39] (4A) p 120
gfwFor Kummer Polynomials explicitly computable $P_1(T) = T$, $P_3(T) = T(1-T)$, $P_5(T) = T(1-T)(1-10T+T^2), \dots$ and for $m = 1, \dots, \frac{p-3}{2}$ then $P_{2m+1}(-t)B_{p-1-2m} \equiv 0 \bmod p$.	Kummer	1857	[39] (4D) p 125
Mirimanoff congruences : $\phi_{p-1}(t) \equiv 0 \bmod p$, $\phi_{p-2}(t)\phi_2(t) \equiv 0 \bmod p$, $\phi_{(p+1)/2}\phi_{(p-1)/2}(t) \equiv 0 \bmod p$.	Mirimanoff	1909	[39], (1B) p 145
$2^{p-1} - 1 \equiv 0 \bmod p^2$.	Wieferich	1909	[39], (3A) p151
gfwFor $m = 1, \dots, \frac{p-3}{2}$ then $\phi_{2m+1}(t)B_{p-1-2m} \equiv 0 \bmod p$.	Mirimanoff	1909	[39] p 145
$5^{p-1} - 1 \equiv 0 \bmod p^2$ and $\sum_{j=1}^{[p/5]} \frac{1}{j} \equiv 0 \bmod p$	Vandiver	1914	[61]
$\sum_{j=1}^{[p/3]} \frac{1}{j^2} \equiv 0 \bmod p$.	Vandiver	1925	[39] (5B) p 157
For $m = 1, \dots, 31$ then $m^{p-1} \equiv 1 \bmod p^2$	Morishima	1931	[39] (6E) p 160
$\sum_{j=1}^{[p/6]} \frac{1}{j^2} \equiv 0 \bmod p$.	Schwindt	1933	[39] (5C) p 157
Let $n_0 = (45!)^{88}$. If $p > n_0$ then for the even Bernoulli Number B_{p-1-2m} for $m = 1, \dots, [Log(p)^{1/3}]$ verify $B_{p-1-2m} \equiv 0 \bmod p$.	Krasner	1934	[24], [39] (2A) p 149
For $d = 2, \dots, p-1$ $(1 - d^{-2m})B_{p-1-2m} \equiv$ $(p-1-2m)d^{-2m-1} \sum_{l=1}^{d} \sum_{1 \leq j < \frac{lp}{d}} \frac{1}{j^{2m+1}} \bmod p$.	Vandiver	1937	[66], [39] (5B) p 108.
for $n = 2, 3, 4, 6$ then $\sum_{j=1}^{[p/n]} \frac{1}{j} \equiv 0 \bmod p$.	Yamada	1941	[39], (5A) p 156

(2/8) If the first case of Fermat's Last Theorem would fail for p then:			
Condition	*Author*	*date*	*Reference*
gfw $p^{[\sqrt{p}]-1}$ divides the first factor $h*$	Eichler	1965	[39], (7A) p185
If $s \in \mathbb{Z}, s \not\equiv 0 \bmod p$ denote $\overline{s}$ the unique integer such that $s \equiv \overline{s} \bmod p$ and $1 \leq \overline{s} \leq p-1$. Let s' be any integer such that $s's \equiv 1 \bmod p$. For each $n = 1, 2, \ldots, p-2$, let E_n be the set of all integers s, $1 \leq s \leq p-2$ such that $\overline{(n+1)'ns} < s$. The Le Lidec polynomials are $\Lambda_n(T) = \sum_{s \in E_n} \overline{s'} T^{p-s}$. The Le Lidec congruences are : $\phi_{p-1}(t) \equiv 0 \bmod p$ $\Lambda_2(t) \equiv 0 \bmod p$ $\vdots$ $\Lambda_{p-2}(t) \equiv 0 \bmod p$.	Le Lidec	1967	[39],(1D) p148
$i(p) > [\sqrt{p}] - 1$	Skula	1977	[49]
For $\mu = 1, 3, 5, 7, 9, 11, 13$ then $\sum_{j=1}^{[p/3]} \frac{1}{j^\mu} \equiv 0 \bmod p$, $\sum_{j=1}^{[p/6]} \frac{1}{j^\mu} \equiv 0 \bmod p$.	Ribenboim	1979	[39],(5E) p 159
$q^{p-1} - 1 \equiv 0 \bmod p^2$ (Granville-Monagan) for all prime $q \leq 89$	Granville	1988	[16]
For $k, N \in \mathbb{N}$, $N \in \{2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10\} \cup \{12\}$ $0 \leq k \leq N-1$ then $S(k,N) = \sum_{j=[kp/N]+1}^{[(k+1)p/N]} \frac{1}{j} \equiv 0 \bmod p$	Skula	1992	[50] ,[53]
If the Kummer/Mirimanoff system of congruences has non trivial solutions, then $i(p) \geq [(\frac{p}{2})^{1/3}]$	Skula	1994	[54],[55]
$q^{p-1} - 1 \equiv 0 \bmod p^2$ for all prime $q \leq 113$	Susuki	1994	[56]
There exists $L \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $p > L$, then : for $k, N \in \mathbb{N}$, $2 \leq N \leq 94$, $0 \leq k \leq N-1$ $S(k,N) = \sum_{j=[kp/N]+1}^{[(k+1)p/N]} \frac{1}{j} \equiv 0 \bmod p$	Cirànek	1994	[5]

.

(3/8) If the first case of Fermat's Last Theorem would fail for p then:

Condition	*Author*	*date*	*Reference*
For $k, N \in \mathbb{N}, \quad 2 \leq N \leq 46, \quad 0 \leq k \leq N-1$ $S(k,N) = \sum_{j=[kp/N]+1}^{[(k+1)p/N]} \frac{1}{j} \equiv 0 \bmod p$	Dilcher Skula	1995	[9]
gfw For $f \in \mathbb{N}, \quad e_p + 2 \leq f \leq p-1$, for each set $I_f = \{g_1, g_2, \dots, g_f \quad \vert \quad i \neq i' \Rightarrow g_i \neq g_i'\}$, there exists a set $L(I_f) = \{l_i, \quad l_i \in \mathbb{N}, \quad i = 1, \dots, f\}$ such that $\sum_{i=1}^{f} g_i \times l_i \equiv 0 \bmod p$ and $\phi_{2m+1}(t) \sum_{i=1}^{f} g_{i(2m+1)} \times l_i \equiv 0 \bmod p$ for $m = 1, \dots, \frac{p-3}{2}$.	Quême	1998	pro 2 p. 76
gfw There exists $r \in \mathbb{N}, \quad r \leq min(e_p + 2, \frac{p-1}{2})$, depending only on p and t, such that, for each primitive root u mod p, there exists a set $N_r(u) = \{n_1, n_2, \dots, n_r\}$ verifying $\sum_{i=1}^{r} u_i \times n_i \equiv 0 \bmod p$ and for all $m = 1, 2, \dots, \frac{p-3}{2}$ - $\phi_{2m+1}(t) \times (\sum_{i=1}^{r} u_{(2m+1)i} \times n_i) \equiv 0 \bmod p$, - p does not divide simultaneously $\phi_{2m+1}(t)$ and $\sum_{i=1}^{r} u_{(2m+1)i} \times n_i$.	Quême	1998	cor 9.9 p. 105
gfw r_p $p-$rank of class group of $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$. There are at least $\frac{p-3}{2} - r_p$ different $m \in \mathbb{N}$, $1 \leq m \leq \frac{p-3}{2}$ with $\phi_{2m+1}(t) \equiv 0 \bmod p$.	Quême	1998	cor 9.12 p. 109

(4/8) If the first case of Fermat's Last Theorem would fail for p then:			
Condition	*Author*	*date*	*Reference*
gfw Let $I_\phi = \{2m_i + 1 \quad \vert \quad i = 1, \dots, r-1,$ $\phi^*_{2m_i+1}(t) \not\equiv 0 \bmod p, \quad 0 \le m_i \le \frac{p-3}{2}\}.$ We have the equivalence $\sum_{i=1}^{r} \frac{u_i l_i}{x+\zeta^{u_i} y} + \sum_{i=1}^{r} \frac{u_i l_i}{x+\zeta^{-u_i} y} \equiv 0 \bmod \pi^{p-1}$ $\Longleftrightarrow$ $l_1 \equiv (-1)^{r-1} \times \prod_{i=1}^{r-1} u_{2m_i+1} \bmod p,$ $\vdots$ $l_{r-1} \equiv (-1) \times \sum_{i=1}^{r-1} u_{2m_i+1} \bmod p,$ $l_r = 1.$	Quême	2000	thm 9.10 p. 105
Let K be an intermediate field, with $\mathbb{Q} \subset K \subset \mathbb{Q}(\zeta), \quad [K:\mathbb{Q}] = g, \quad p-1 = g \times f$, where f is odd and $gcd(f,g) = 1$. Let r_K be the p-rank of the class group of $K/\mathbb{Q}$. Then, if $r_K < \frac{g-1}{2}$, there are at least $\frac{g-1}{2} - r_K$ Mirimanoff polynomials congruences $\phi_{f(2n+1)}(t) \equiv 0 \bmod p, \quad 1 \le 2n+1 < g.$	Quême	2000	thm 11.3 p. 118

(5/8) If the first case of Fermat's Last Theorem would fail for p then:			
Condition	*Author*	*date*	*Reference*
Let $p-1 = f \times g$ with f odd. Let K be the intermediate field $\mathbb{Q} \subset K \subset \mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$ and $[K : \mathbb{Q}] = g$. Suppose that p does not divide the class number of $K/\mathbb{Q}$. Then we have the Mirimanoff's polynomials congruences $\phi_{f(2n+1)}(t) \equiv 0 \text{ mod } p$, $2n+1 = 1, 3, 5, \ldots, g-1$.	Quême	2000	cor 11.2 p. 118
gfw Let $f \in \mathbb{N}$, $p-1 \equiv 0 \text{ mod } f$, $f \not\equiv 0 \text{ mod } 2$. Let $g = \frac{p-1}{f}$. Let K be the field $\mathbb{Q} \subset K \subset \mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$, $[K : \mathbb{Q}] = g$. If p does not divide the class number of the field extension $K/\mathbb{Q}$ then $\sum_{i=0, \quad i^{2f} \equiv 1 \ mod \ p}^{p-1} (i^{f-1} \times t^i) \equiv 0 \text{ mod } p$.	Quême	2000	cor **??** p. **??**
gfw Suppose that $p-1 \equiv 0 \text{ mod } 3$. Let K be the field $\mathbb{Q} \subset K \subset \mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$, $[K : \mathbb{Q}] = \frac{p-1}{3}$. then p should divide the class number of $K/\mathbb{Q}$.	Quême	1999	thm 11.6 p. 120
gfw Let $t \equiv -\frac{y}{x} \text{ mod } p$. Let r_g be the minimal rank defined in the relation (105) p 112. If FLT First Case fails for p, then 1.) there exists **exactly** $\frac{p-1}{2g} - r_g + 1$ different values m, $m \in \mathbb{N}$, $1 \le m \le \frac{p-1}{2g} - 1$, such that we have for m the g Mirimanoff polynomial congruences: $\phi^*_{2m+1+\alpha(p-1)/g}(t) \equiv 0 \text{ mod } p$, for $\alpha = 0, \ldots, g-1$. 2.) there exists **exactly** $r_g - 1$ different values m, $m \in \mathbb{N}$, $1 \le m \le \frac{p-1}{2g} - 1$, such that we have for m **at least** one $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}$, $0 \le \alpha \le g-1$ with the Mirimanoff polynomial congruence: $\phi^*_{2m+1+\alpha(p-1)/g}(t) \not\equiv 0 \text{ mod } p$.	Quême	2001	thm 10.3 p. 112

(6/8) If the first case of Fermat's Last Theorem would fail for p then:			
Condition	*Author*	*date*	*Reference*
gfw Let u be a primitive root $\bmod p$. Then $p-1$ congruences: $\sum_{i=1}^{(p-1)/2} u_i \times (t^{m_{i,k}} + t^{p-m_{i,k}}) \equiv 0 \bmod p,$ $k = 1, \dots, p-1, \quad u_i \times m_{i,k} \equiv k \bmod p,$ $1 \le m_{i,k} \le p-1.$	Quême	2000	thm 12.6 p.129
gfw Let f be an integer with $f \ge min(e_p+2, \frac{p-1}{2})$. Let E_f be **any** set $E_f =$ $\{g_i \in \mathbb{N}, \quad i = 1, \dots, f, \quad 1 \le g_i \le p-1\}$. Let K_f be **any** set $K_f =$ $\{k_j \in \mathbb{N}, \quad j = 1, \dots, f, \quad 1 \le k_j \le p-1\}$. Let us define for $i = 1, \dots f, \quad j = 1, \dots, f$ $m_{ij} \equiv g_i^{-1} \times k_j \bmod p, \quad 1 \le m_{ij} \le p-1,$ $g_i \in E_f, \quad k_j \in K_f,$ $\theta_{ij} = (t^{m_{ij}} + t^{p-m_{ij}}) \bmod p.$ If the first case of FLT would fail for p then the $f \times f$ determinant $\Delta_f(t) = \lvert\theta_{ij}\rvert_{1 \le i \le p-1, \quad 1 \le j \le p-1} \equiv 0 \bmod p.$	Quême	1998	thm 12.4 p. 128

(7/8) If the first case of Fermat's Last Theorem would fail for p then:			
Condition	*Author*	*date*	*Reference*
gfw Let f be an integer with $f \geq min(e_p+2, \frac{p-1}{2})$. Let u be a primitive root mod p. Let $l \in \mathbb{N}, \quad 1 \leq l \leq p-1$. Let $m \in \mathbb{N}, \quad 1 \leq l \leq p-1$. the determinant $\Delta_f(t) =$ $\lvert t^{u_{m \times j - l \times i}} + t^{p - u_{m \times j - l \times i}} \rvert_{1 \leq i \leq f, \quad 1 \leq j \leq f}$ $\equiv 0 \bmod p$	Quême	2000	cor 12.5 p. 128
gfw Let $a \in \mathbb{N}$ be the order of t mod p. Then $a > \frac{p-1}{e_p+2}$.	Quême	2000	thm 12.7 p.129
(**gfw** if $\mu = 3$). Let $\mu \in \{3, 5, 7\}$. Then $\sum_{j=1}^{[p/4]} \frac{1}{j^\mu} \equiv 0 \bmod p$.	Quême	1998	cor 16.14 p.174
(**gfw** if $\mu = 3$). $3(p-2)$ congruences mod p: For all $\mu \in \{3, 5, 7\}$. For all $d \in \mathbb{N}, \quad 1 \leq d \leq p-2$ then $\sum_{j \in \cup_{l=1}^{d} [\frac{lp}{d+1}, \frac{lp}{d}[} \frac{1}{j^\mu} \equiv 0 \bmod p$.	Quême	1998	cor 16.15 p. 174
gfw For every $1 \leq m \leq \frac{p-3}{2}$ with $\phi_{2m+1}(t) \not\equiv 0 \bmod p$, for every $d \in \mathbb{N}, \quad 1 \leq d \leq p-2$ then $\sum_{j \in \cup [\frac{lp}{d+1}, \frac{lp}{d}[} \frac{1}{j^{2m+1}} \equiv 0 \bmod p$.	Quême	1998	cor 16.16 p.175
gfw Let $p > (45!)^{88}$. $[Log(p)^{1/3}](p-2)$ congruences mod p: For all $m = 1, \dots, [Log(p)^{1/3}]$. For all $d \in \mathbb{N}, \quad 1 \leq d \leq p-2$ then $\sum_{j \in \cup_{l=1}^{d} [\frac{lp}{d+1}, \frac{lp}{d}]} \frac{1}{j^{2m+1}} \equiv 0 \bmod p$.	Quême	1998	cor 16.17 p. 176
(**gfw** if $\mu = 3$). $3(p-2)(p-3)$ congruences mod p: let $\mu \in \{3, 5, 7\}$. For all $d_1, d_2 \in \mathbb{N}, \quad 1 \leq d_1 < d_2 \leq p-2$, $\sum_{l=1}^{d_1} \sum_{m=1}^{d_2} \sum_{j \in [\frac{lp}{d_1+1}, \frac{lp}{d_1}] \cap [\frac{mp}{d_2+1}, \frac{mp}{d_2}[} \frac{1}{j^\mu}$ $\equiv 0 \bmod p$,	Quême	1998	thm 16.21 p. 181

(8/8) If the first case of Fermat's Last Theorem would fail for p then:			
Condition	*Author*	*date*	*Reference*
(**gfw** if $\mu = 3$). $3(p-2)$ congruences mod p: let $\mu \in \{3,5,7\}$. For all $d \in \mathbb{N}, \quad 1 \leq d \leq p-2$, $\sum_{j>p/2}^{p-1} \sum_{m=1}^{d} \sum_{j \in [\frac{mp}{(d+1)}, \frac{mp}{d}[} \frac{1}{j^\mu} \equiv 0 \mod p$,	Quême	1998	cor 16.22 p. 182
gfw $p-1$ congruences, generalization of Cauchy criterion to exponential congruences. For $k = 1, \ldots, p-1$ $\sum_{j=(p+1)/2}^{p-1} \frac{1}{j^3} \times (t^{(k \times j^3 \mod p)} + t^{(p-k \times j^3 \mod p)})$ $\equiv 0 \mod p$.	Quême	2000	thm 16.23 p. 182
A particular case of Fermat-Wiles: Let $x, y, z \in \mathbb{Z} - \{0\}$, pairwise coprime. Then $p \Vert (x-y) \times (y-z) \times (z-x)$ implies that $x^p + y^p + z^p \neq 0$.	Quême	2001	thm 12.11 p. 134

18 FLT first case: A generalization to diophantine equations $\frac{x^p+y^p}{x+y}=t_1^p$ and $x^p+y^p+c\times z^p=0$

18.1 Introduction

Let $p>5$ be a prime as assumed in all this paper. Let $x,y,z\in\mathbb{Z}-\{0\}$ mutually coprime. Let us consider the two generalizations of the Fermat's Equation first case

$$\frac{x^p+y^p}{x+y}=t_1^p,\quad x,y,t_1\in\mathbb{Z}-\{0\},\quad xy(x^2-y^2)\not\equiv 0 \bmod p, \tag{169}$$

and

$$x^p+y^p+c\times z^p=0,\quad x,y,z,c\in\mathbb{Z}-\{0\},\quad xy(x^2-y^2)\not\equiv 0 \bmod p. \tag{170}$$

Recall that $p>5$ is assumed in this paper.

- When $x\times y\times z\not\equiv 0 \bmod p$ the Fermat's equation $x^p+y^p+z^p=0$ leads to the three Barlow-Abel relations

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{x^p+y^p}{x+y}&=t_1^p,\quad x+y=t^p,\quad t_1\in\mathbb{Z}-\{0\},\\ \frac{y^p+z^p}{x+y}&=r_1^p,\quad y+z=r^p,\quad r_1\in\mathbb{Z}-\{0\},\\ \frac{z^p+x^p}{x+y}&=s_1^p,\quad z+x=s^p,\quad s_1\in\mathbb{Z}-\{0\}.\end{aligned}$$

  At first, if we assume that all primes c_i dividing c verify $c_i\not\equiv 1 \bmod p$,, we shall show that the Generalized Fermat-Wiles equation,

$$x^p+y^p+c\times z^p=0,\quad xy(x^2-y^2)\not\equiv 0 \bmod p,$$

  implies the partial Barlow-Abel equation

$$\frac{x^p+y^p}{x+y}=t_1^p,\quad x+y=t^p,\quad t_1\in\mathbb{Z}-\{0\}.$$

  which is thus more general than equation (170) p.193 and a fortiori more general that the first case of Fermat, $x^p+y^p+z^p=0,\quad xyz\not\equiv 0 \bmod p$.

- We shall use the fact that several criteria on p obtained for the first case of FLT in the literature and almost all the new criteria on p that we have obtained rest on the factorization properties of **one and only one** of the Barlow-Abel equations $\frac{x^p+y^p}{x+y}=t_1^p$ where $t_1\in\mathbb{Z}-\{0\}$.

- The first example of criterion on p for the first case of FLT is Cauchy's criterion, see Ribenboim [39] p 120. As an example, we detail the proof of generalization of Cauchy's criterion for the Generalized Fermat-Wiles equation.
- For a comparison with results obtained for the Generalized Fermat-Wiles equation $x^p + y^p + cz^p = 0$, see Finch [11], survey for this topic, and Barlow-Abel equation $\frac{x^p+y^p}{x+y} = t_1^p$, see Terjanian [58]

18.2 Some results

Lemma 18.1. *Let* $x, y, z \in \mathbb{Z} - \{0\}$ *mutually co-prime. Let* $c \in \mathbb{Z} - \{0\}$*. Suppose that* $x \times y \times z \times c \not\equiv 0 \ mod\ p$*. Let* $c = \pm \prod_{i=1}^{m} c_i^{\alpha_i}$ *be the factorization in primes of* c*. Suppose that* $c_i \not\equiv 1 \ mod\ p, \quad i = 1, \dots, m$*. Then* $x^p + y^p + c \times z^p = 0$ *implies the generalization of Barlow-Abel relation* $\frac{x^p+y^p}{x+y} = t_1^p$ *and the relation* $\frac{x+y}{c} = t^p$*.*

Proof. From $x^p+y^p+c\times z^p = 0$, we get $(x+y)\times(\frac{x^p+y^p}{x+y})+c\times z^p = 0$. Classically, all the primes divisors q of $\frac{x^p+y^p}{x+y}$ verify $q \equiv 1 \bmod p$. From hypothesis on c, we deduce that c and $\frac{x^p+y^p}{x+y}$ are coprime and so c divides $(x+y)$. Therefore $(\frac{x+y}{c}) \times (\frac{x^p+y^p}{x+y}) + z^p = 0$. Classically, $(x + y)$ and $(\frac{x^p+y^p}{x+y})$ are coprime and so $(\frac{x+y}{c})$ and $(\frac{x^p+y^p}{x+y})$ are coprime and so $\frac{x+y}{c} = t^p$ and $\frac{x^p+y^p}{x+y} = t_1^p$. ☐

Theorem 18.2. *Generalization of Cauchy's criterion*

Let $p > 5$ *be a prime. If* $\frac{x^p+y^p}{x+y} = t_1^p, \quad x, y, t_1 \in \mathbb{Z}, \quad xy(x^2 - y^2) \not\equiv 0 \ mod\ p$ *then* p *verifies the congruence*

$$\sum_{j=1}^{(p-1)/2} j^{p-4} \equiv 0 \ mod\ p.$$

Proof.

- Suppose, at first, that $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)/\mathbb{Q}$ is a principal field. Then, similarly to proposition 2 p.76, it is possible to write

  $$(x + \zeta y) = \zeta^v \times \eta \times \gamma^p, \quad v \in \mathbb{Z}, \quad \eta \in \mathbb{Z}[\zeta + \zeta^{-1}]^*, \quad \gamma \in \mathbb{Z}[\zeta].$$

  Then, by conjugation,

  $$(x + \zeta^{-1} y) = \zeta^{-v} \times \overline{\eta} \times \overline{\gamma^p}.$$

  Then, observing that $\eta = \overline{\eta}$ we get, dividing these two relations

  $$\frac{(x + \zeta y)}{(x + \zeta^{-1} y)} = \zeta^{2v} \frac{\gamma^p}{\overline{\gamma^p}}.$$

Then, applying proposition 1 p.73, we get $\gamma^p \equiv \overline{\gamma^p} \bmod \pi^{p+1}$ and so

$$\frac{(x+\zeta y)}{(x+\zeta^{-1}y)} \equiv \zeta^{2v} \bmod \pi^{p+1}.$$

which leads to

$$x+\zeta y \equiv \zeta^{2v}x+\zeta^{2v-1}y \bmod \pi^{p+1}$$

Note, that this relation implies

$$x+\zeta y \equiv \zeta^{2v}x+\zeta^{2v-1}y \bmod p$$

wich implies $2v \equiv 1 \bmod p$ and then

$$(x-y)+\zeta(y-x) \equiv 0 \bmod \pi^{p+1}$$

so

$$(x-y)(1-\zeta) \equiv 0 \bmod \pi^{p+1},$$

and finally $x-y \equiv 0 \bmod p^2$, which contradicts hypothesis.

- Suppose that $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)/\mathbb{Q}$ is not principal : then, the proof of Cauchy's criterion needs only one Barlow-Abel congruence $\frac{x^p+y^p}{x+y}=t_1^p$ as it is possible to verify in classical proof, see for instance Ribenboim, [39] p 120-125.

$\square$

Theorem 18.3. *Let $p>5$ be a prime. Let $x,y,z \in \mathbb{Z}-\{0\}$ mutually coprime with $xy(x^2-y^2) \not\equiv 0$ mod p.*

- *If $\frac{x^p+y^p}{x+y}=t_1^p, \quad t_1 \in \mathbb{Z}$, then p verifies all the criteria, congruences on p or on $t=-\frac{x}{y}$ mod p, quoted* **(gfw)** *in the table of results of the comparative survey of the previous section 17 p.183*
- *Let $c \in \mathbb{Z}-\{0\}$ where*

  $c=\pm\prod_{i=1}^{m} c_i^{\alpha_i}$ is the factorization of c in primes. If $c_i \not\equiv 1$ mod p, $\quad i=1,\dots,m$ and if $x^p+y^p+c\times z^p=0$ then p verifies all the criteria, congruences on p or on $t=-\frac{x}{y}$ mod p, quoted **(gfw)** *in the table of results of the comparative survey of the previous section 17 p.183.*

  Proof.

  Proof similar to theorem 18.2 p.194.

- The proofs of all these criteria needs only to assume one Barlow-Abel congruence as hypothesis, except all the case with $\mu \geq 5$ which occurs in corollary 16.11 p.172, corollary 16.12 p.172, corollary 16.13 p.173, corollary 16.14 p.174, corollary 16.15 p.174, corollary 16.20 p.181, theorem 16.21 p.181 and corollary 16.22 p.182, where several Barlow-Abel equations are needed simultaneously for proof and cannot be used in this Fermat-Wiles Generalized equation.

$\square$

Remark: This result goes toward the **Terjanian conjecture** which asserts that if $xy(x^2 - y^2) \not\equiv 0 \mod p$ and $\frac{x^p+y^p}{x+y} = t_1^p, \quad t_1 \in \mathbb{Z}$, then the Kummer system of congruences of this Barlow relation has only the trivial solution, see [58].

19 FLT second case : miscelleanous

Contrary to a largely spread idea, it seems it is possible to use methods of this note to partial results on the second case of Fermat's Last Theorem. In this direction, we prove these, in our opinion, new results, first on an elementary approach, then following some results in Washington, [68]:

19.1 An elementary approach

Theorem 19.1. **** Let $p \in \mathbb{N}$, $p > 2$ be a prime. Let $x, y, z \in \mathbb{Z} - \{0\}$, $p \parallel y$. Then $x^p + y^p + z^p \neq 0$.*

Proof.

- From hypothesis, $(x + \zeta^u y) \not\equiv 0 \bmod \pi$. Then all the prime ideals $\mathbf{q}$ dividing $(x + \zeta^u y)$ are of degree 1, thus $N_{Q(\zeta)/Q}(\mathbf{q}) = q$ where $q \in \mathbb{N}$ is a prime with $q \equiv 1 \bmod p$. Therefore, though we deal with second case of Fermat's Last Theorem, the relation (2.5) p 119 of [39], and also proposition (3B) p 119 can be used. In the same way the relation (4.7) p122 of [39] can be used to obtain

$$\prod_{i \in I(u,d)} (x + \zeta^{u_i} y) = \zeta^m \gamma^p, \quad m \in \mathbb{N}, \quad \gamma \in \mathbb{Z}[\zeta].$$

- From $y \equiv 0 \bmod p$ and from $\prod_{i \in I(u,d)} (x + \zeta^{u_i} y) = \zeta^m \gamma^p$, we obtain $x^{(p-1)/2} \equiv \zeta^m c \bmod p$, $c \in \mathbb{Z}$. Then $m = 0$, therefore $\prod_{i \in I(u,d)} (x + \zeta^{u_i} y) = \gamma^p$, so $\prod_{i \in I(u,d)} ((x + y) + (\zeta^{u_i} - 1)y) = \gamma^p$, hence

$$(x + y)^{(p-1)/2} + (x + y)^{(p-3)/2} y \sum_{i \in I(u,d)} (\zeta^{u_i} - 1) \equiv \gamma^p \bmod \pi^{2(p-1)}.$$

- From Barlow-Abel formula, see [39], formula (1.9) p 54, we have $x + y = t^p$, $t \in \mathbb{Z}$. Let $t_1 = t^{(p-1)/2}$. Then, $(x + y)^{(p-1)/2} - \gamma^p = t_1^p - \gamma^p$. We have $t_1^p - \gamma^p \equiv 0 \bmod \pi$, then from proposition (7.1), we have $t_1^p - \gamma^p \equiv 0 \bmod \pi^{p+1}$, therefore $\sum_{i \in I(u,d)} (\zeta^{u_i} - 1) x^{(p-3)/2} y \equiv 0 \bmod \pi^{p+1}$ so $\sum_{i \in I(u,d)} (\zeta^{u_i} - 1) \equiv 0 \bmod \pi^2$, so $\sum_{i \in I(u,d)} u_i (\zeta - 1) \equiv 0 \bmod \pi^2$, by simplification $\sum_{i \in I(u,d)} u_i \equiv 0 \bmod \pi$, hence $\sum_{i \in I(u,d)} u_i \equiv 0 \bmod p$.

- Let $d = 1, 2, \dots, p-2$. Let $I(u,d) = \{i | \quad 1 \leq i \leq p-1, \quad u_{\nu-i} + u_{\nu-i+ind_u(d)} > p\}$. For i given and for d varying from 1 to $p-2$, the quantity $u_{\nu-i+ind_u(d)} \bmod p$ takes all integer values from 1 to $p-1$ except the value $p - u_{\nu-i}$ which would correspond to $d = p - 1$. Therefore the quantity $Q(i,d) = u_{\nu-i} + u_{\nu-i+ind_u(d)}$

takes all values from $u_{\nu-i}+1$ to $u_{\nu-i}+p-1$ except $u_{\nu-i}+p-u_{\nu-i}=p$. Therefore, when d goes through 1 to $p-2$, the expression $Q(i,d)$ takes all values from $p+1$ to $u_{\nu-i}+p-1$ with $Q(i,d)>p$, therefore $Q(i,d)$ takes $u_{\nu-i}-1$ different values with $Q(i,d)>p$.

- From $\sum_{i\in I(u,d)} u_i \equiv 0 \mod p$ for $d=1,\dots,p-2$, we have $\sum_{d=1}^{p-2}\sum_{i\in I(u,d)} u_i \equiv 0 \mod p$.
- In an other part, we obtain from previous estimate of the cardinal number of $Q(i,d)>p$, the congruence $\sum_{d=1}^{p-2}\sum_{i\in I(u,d)} u_i = \sum_{i=1}^{p-1}(u_{\nu-i}-1)u_i \equiv (p-1)^2 - \sum_{i=1}^{p-1} u_i \equiv 1 \mod p$, a contradiction, which achieves the proof.

$\square$

Remark : Here, we have used the property $\alpha\equiv\beta,\quad \alpha\not\equiv 0 \mod \pi \Longrightarrow \alpha^p \equiv \beta^p \mod \pi^{p+1}$: it is important to observe that the classical result $\alpha^p\equiv\beta^p \mod \pi^{p-1}$ would not allow to conclude.

The next result is another proof of the same result interesting because it is strictly elementary in $\mathbb{Z}$.

Theorem 19.2. **** Let $p\in\mathbb{N},\quad p>3$ be a prime. Let $x,y,z\in\mathbb{Z}-\{0\},\quad p\parallel y$. Then $x^p+y^p+z^p\neq 0$.*

Proof. We shall show that if $x^p+y^p+z^p=0$ and $p|y$ then $p^2|y$.

- From Barlow-Abel, see (1.9) p 54, we have $\frac{x^p+y^p}{x+y}=t_1^p$ with $t_1\in\mathbb{N}$. From little Fermat theorem, $x^p+y^p\equiv x+y \mod p$, so $t_1^p\equiv 1 \mod p$, hence $t_1^p\equiv 1\mod p^2$ and

$$x^p+y^p\equiv x+y \mod p^2. \tag{171}$$

- From Barlow-Abel, we have $\frac{x^p+z^p}{x+z}=ps_1^p$ where $s_1\in\mathbb{N}$. All the prime q dividing s_1 verify $q\equiv 1\mod p$, so $s_1\equiv 1\mod p$ and $s_1^p\equiv 1 \mod p^2$ which leads to

$$\frac{x^p+z^p}{x+z}\equiv p \mod p^3. \tag{172}$$

- We have $\frac{x^p+z^p}{x+z}=x^{p-1}-x^{p-2}z+\dots-xz^{p-2}+z^{p-1}$. From $y|p$, we obtain $x+z\equiv 0\mod p^{p-1}$ and thus $x+z\equiv 0 \mod p^3$ from hypothesis $p>3$. Then we obtain $x^{p-1}-x^{p-2}(-x)+\dots-x(-x)^{p-2}+(-x)^{p-1}\equiv p\mod p^3$, so $px^{p-1}\equiv p\mod p^3$, hence

$$x^{p-1}\equiv 1 \mod p^2. \tag{173}$$

- From relations (171) p.198 and (173) p.198, we obtain $y \equiv 0 \mod p^2$, which completes the proof.

$\square$

Remark: With an application of Furtwangler theorem in class field theory, Vandiver [67], see also Ribenboim [39] (3E) p. 170, proved the better result: Let $p \in \mathbb{N}, \quad p > 3$ be a prime. Let $x, y, z \in \mathbb{Z} - \{0\}, \quad p^2 \parallel y$. Then $x^p + y^p + z^p \neq 0$.

19.2 Cyclotomic number fields approach

We apply similar technics to those of Washington,[68], chapter 9 p 167, for FLT second case.

- Let x, y, z be a solution of second case with $y \equiv 0 \mod p$. Suppose that $h^+ \not\equiv 0 \mod p$. We have $\frac{x+\zeta y}{x+\zeta^{-1}y} = 1 + \frac{(\zeta-\zeta^{-1})y}{x+\zeta^{-1}y}$ and so $\frac{x+\zeta y}{x+\zeta^{-1}y} \equiv 1 \mod \pi^p$. Then, we are in the situation to apply Washington [68], lemma 9.1 p 169 and lemma 9.2 p 170, to get
$$\frac{x+\zeta y}{x+\zeta^{-1}y} = \gamma^p, \quad \gamma \in \mathbb{Q}(\zeta).$$
Therefore, from proposition 1 p.73, $\frac{(\zeta-\zeta^{-1})y}{x+\zeta^{-1}y} = \gamma^p - 1 \equiv 0 \mod \pi^{p+1}$, which implies that $y \equiv 0 \mod p^2$, result that we shall prove also, without assuming Vandiver conjecture, in theorems 19.1 p.197 and 19.2 p.198.

- We derive also
$$\frac{(x+\zeta y)^2}{(x+\zeta y)(x+\zeta^{-1}y)} = \gamma^p, \quad \gamma \in \mathbb{Q}(\zeta).$$
From $h^+ \not\equiv 0 \mod p$ we get
$$(x+\zeta y)(x+\zeta^{-1}y) = \eta_1 \times \alpha^p, \quad \alpha \in \mathbb{Z}[\zeta+\zeta^{-1}].$$
and so
$$(x+\zeta y)^2 = \eta_1 \times \gamma^p \times \alpha^p,$$
so, raising to $\frac{p+1}{2}$ power,
$$(x+\zeta y)(x+\zeta y)^p = \eta_1^{(p+1)/2} \times \gamma^{p(p+1)/2} \times \alpha^{p(p+1)/2},$$
also
$$(x+\zeta y) = \eta_1^{(p+1)/2} \times (\frac{\gamma^{(p+1)/2} \times \alpha^{(p+1)/2}}{(x+\zeta y)})^p,$$
and finally
$$x+\zeta y = \eta \times \beta^p, \quad \beta \in \mathbb{Z}[\zeta], \quad \eta \in \mathbb{Z}[\zeta+\zeta^{-1}]^*.$$

- We have seen that $y \equiv 0 \bmod p^2$ and, classically, $x+y+z \equiv 0 \bmod p^2$, see for instance Ribenboim [39] (3B)-2 p 58, therefore $x+z \equiv 0 \bmod p^2$. Thus
$$\frac{x+\zeta z}{x+\zeta^{-1}z} \equiv \frac{x(1-\zeta)}{x(1-\zeta^{-1})} \bmod p^2,$$
which leads to
$$-\zeta^{-1}\frac{x+\zeta z}{x+\zeta^{-1}z} \equiv 1 \bmod \pi^{2(p-1)}.$$
Let $\omega = -\zeta^{-1} \times \frac{x+\zeta z}{x+\zeta^{-1}z}$. Then $\overline{\omega} = -\zeta \times \frac{x+\zeta^{-1}z}{x+\zeta z}$. Therefore $\omega \times \overline{\omega} = 1$ and $\omega \equiv 1 \bmod \pi^{2(p-1)}$, and also $\omega\mathbb{Z}[\zeta] = \mathbf{b}^p$, where $\mathbf{b}$ is a fractional ideal of $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$, because $(x+\zeta z) = \pi \times \mathbf{s}_y^p$ where $\mathbf{s}_y$ is an integral ideal of $\mathbb{Z}[\zeta]$. Thus, we are again in situation to apply Washington lemma 9.1 p 169 and lemma 9.2 p 170, to get
$$-\zeta^{-1} \times \frac{x+\zeta z}{x+\zeta^{-1}z} = \gamma^p, \quad \gamma \in \mathbb{Q}(\zeta).$$

- We get
$$\zeta^{-1} \times (\frac{(x+\zeta z)^2}{(x+\zeta z)(x+\zeta^{-1}z)} = \gamma_y^p, \quad \gamma_y \in \mathbb{Q}(\zeta). \tag{174}$$
Let us note $\lambda = \zeta - 1$ and $\mu = (\zeta-1)(\zeta^{-1}-1)$. From $h^+ \not\equiv 0 \bmod p$, we derive
$$(x+\zeta z)(x+\zeta^{-1}z) = \mu \times \eta_1 \times \alpha^p, \quad \eta_1 \in \mathbb{Z}[\zeta+\zeta^{-1}]^*, \quad \alpha \in \mathbb{Z}[\zeta+\zeta^{-1}].$$
We have also
$$x+\zeta z = \lambda \times \delta, \quad \delta \in \mathbb{Z}[\zeta].$$
Raising relation (174) p.200 to the $\frac{p+1}{2}$ power, we obtain
$$(x+\zeta z)(x+\zeta z)^p = -\zeta^{(p+1)/2} \times \mu^{(p+1)/2} \times \eta_1^{(p+1)/2} \times \alpha^{p(p+1)/2} \times \gamma_y^{p(p+1)/2}$$
and so
$$(x+\zeta z) = -\zeta^{(p+1)/2} \times \frac{\mu^{(p+1)/2}}{\lambda^p} \times \eta_1^{(p+1)/2} \times (\frac{\alpha^{(p+1)/2} \times \gamma_y^{(p+1)/2}}{\delta})^p$$
which gives
$$(x+\zeta z) = -\zeta^{(p+1)/2} \times \frac{\mu^{(p+1)/2}}{\lambda^p} \times \eta \times \beta^p, \quad \beta \in \mathbb{Z}[\zeta], \quad \eta \in \mathbb{Z}[\zeta+\zeta^{-1}],$$
so
$$(x+\zeta z) = -\zeta^{(p+1)/2} \times \frac{(\zeta-1)^{(p+1)/2} \times \zeta^{-(p+1)/2} \times (1-\zeta)^{(p+1)/2} \times \eta \times \beta^p}{(\zeta-1)^p},$$

and finally

$$(x+\zeta z) = (-1)^{(p-1)/2} \times (\zeta - 1) \times \eta \times \beta^p, \quad \beta \in \mathbb{Z}[\zeta], \quad \eta \in \mathbb{Z}[\zeta + \zeta^{-1}]^*.$$

and, by symmetry on x, z,

$$\begin{aligned}
&(x+\zeta z) = (-1)^{(p-1)/2} \times (\zeta - 1) \times \eta_{y,1} \times \beta_{y,1}^p, \quad \beta_{y,1} \in \mathbb{Z}[\zeta], \quad \eta_{y,1} \in \mathbb{Z}\zeta + \zeta^{-1}]^*,\\
&(z+\zeta x) = (-1)^{(p-1)/2} \times (\zeta - 1) \times \eta_{y,2} \times \beta_{y,2}^p, \quad \beta_{y,2} \in \mathbb{Z}[\zeta], \quad \eta_{y,2} \in \mathbb{Z}\zeta + \zeta^{-1}]^*.
\end{aligned}$$

- We get the two relations

$$\begin{aligned}
\zeta \times (x + \zeta^{-1} z) &= (-1)^{(p-1)/2} \times (\zeta - 1) \times \eta_{y,2} \times \beta_{y,2}^p,\\
x + \zeta^{-1} z &= (-1)^{(p-1)/2} \times (\zeta^{-1} - 1) \times \eta_{y,1} \times (\overline{(\beta_{y,1})^p}),
\end{aligned}$$

and finally

$$\frac{\eta_{y,2}}{\eta_{y,1}} = (-\frac{\overline{\beta_{y,1}}}{\beta_{y,2}})^p.$$

- Finally we summarize all that in the set of simultaneous relations

Theorem 19.3. *Suppose that $h^+ \not\equiv 0$ mod p and $x^p + y^p + z^p = 0, \quad x, y, z \in \mathbb{Z} - \{0\}, \quad y \equiv 0$ mod p; then we have the set of relations*

(175)

$$\begin{aligned}
&y \equiv 0 \ mod\ p^3,\\
&\frac{x+\zeta y}{x+\zeta^{-1} y} = \gamma_x^p, \quad \gamma_x \in \mathbb{Q}(\zeta),\\
&\frac{z+\zeta y}{z+\zeta^{-1} y} = \gamma_z^p, \quad \gamma_z \in \mathbb{Q}(\zeta),\\
&-\zeta^{-1} \times \frac{x+\zeta z}{x+\zeta^{-1} z} = \gamma_y^p, \quad \gamma_y \in \mathbb{Q}(\zeta),\\
&(x+\zeta y) = \eta_x \times \beta_x^p, \quad \beta_x \in \mathbb{Z}[\zeta], \quad \eta_x \in \mathbb{Z}[\zeta + \zeta^{-1}]^*,\\
&(z+\zeta y) = \eta_z \times \beta_z^p, \quad \beta_z \in \mathbb{Z}[\zeta], \quad \eta_z \in \mathbb{Z}[\zeta + \zeta^{-1}]^*,\\
&(x+\zeta z) = (-1)^{(p-1)/2} \times (\zeta - 1) \times \eta_{y,1} \times \beta_{y,1}^p, \quad \beta_{y,1} \in \mathbb{Z}[\zeta], \quad \eta_{y,1} \in \mathbb{Z}\zeta + \zeta^{-1}]^*,\\
&(z+\zeta x) = (-1)^{(p-1)/2} \times (\zeta - 1) \times \eta_{y,2} \times \beta_{y,2}^p, \quad \beta_{y,2} \in \mathbb{Z}[\zeta], \quad \eta_{y,2} \in \mathbb{Z}\zeta + \zeta^{-1}]^*,\\
&\frac{\eta_{y,2}}{\eta_{y,1}} = (-\frac{\overline{\beta_{y,1}}}{\beta_{y,2}})^p.
\end{aligned}$$

19.3 Hilbert class field and representations approach

Recall at first some definitions and properties obtained in representation and class field theory:

- C_p is the p-class group of $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$.
- C_p^1 is the subgroup of C_p whose elements are of order 1 or p. r_p is the rank of C_p and C_p^1 is of order p^{r_p}.
- r_p^- is the p-rank of the relative class group C_p^- and r_p^+ is the p-rank of C_p^+, class group of the field $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta+\zeta^{-1})$.
- There exists a class of ideals $\mathbf{b}$ of $\mathbb{Z}[\zeta]$ such that:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbf{b} \simeq \mathbf{b}_1 \dots \mathbf{b}_{r_p},\\
&\mathbf{b} \not\simeq \mathbb{Z}[\zeta], \quad \mathbf{b}^p \simeq \mathbb{Z}[\zeta],\\
&\mathbf{b}_i \not\simeq \mathbb{Z}[\zeta], \quad \mathbf{b}_i^p \simeq \mathbb{Z}[\zeta], \quad i = 1, \dots, r_p,\\
&\sigma(\mathbf{b}_i) \simeq \mathbf{b}_i^{\mu_i}, \quad \mu_i \in \mathbb{N}, \quad 1 < \mu_i \leq p-1, \quad i = 1, \dots, r_p,\\
&C_p^1 = \oplus_{i=1}^{r_p} < Cl(\mathbf{b}_i) > .
\end{aligned}$$

- There exists $C_i \in \mathbb{Q}(\zeta), \quad i = 1, \dots, r_p^-$, such that

$$\begin{aligned}
&C_i\mathbb{Z}[\zeta] \simeq \mathbf{b}_i^p, \quad Cl(\mathbf{b}_i) \in C_p^-,\\
&C_i \equiv 1 \bmod \pi^{2m_i+1}, \quad 1 \leq m_i \leq \frac{p-3}{2}.
\end{aligned}$$

- From Hilbert class field structure theorem 4.3 p. 56, $C_i \in \mathbb{Q}(\zeta) - \mathbb{Z}[\zeta]^*, \quad i = 1, \dots, r_p^+$, are singular primary and correspond to Hecke component of the relative class group C_p^- and $C_i, \quad i = r_p^+ + 1, \dots, r_p^-$, are **not** singular primary.

This theorem gives the general form of the class field theory structure of the Fermat's equation in the FLT second case: $z \equiv 0 \bmod p$.

Theorem 19.4. **** Suppose that $x^p+y^p+z^p = 0$ with $z \equiv 0 \bmod p, \quad xy \not\equiv 0 \bmod p$. Then x, y verify the relation*

$$\begin{aligned}
&x + y \equiv 0 \ \mathit{mod}\ p^2,\\
&\left(\frac{x+\zeta y}{1-\zeta}\right)/\left(\frac{x+\zeta^{-1}y}{1-\zeta^{-1}}\right) = C_1^{\nu_1} \times \dots \times C_{r_p^+}^{\nu_{r_p^+}} \times \left(\frac{\gamma_1}{\overline{\gamma}_1}\right)^p, \quad \gamma_1 \in \mathbb{Q}(\zeta),\\
&C_i\mathbb{Z}[\zeta] = \mathbf{b}_i^p, \quad Cl(\mathbf{b}_i) \in C_p^-, \quad \textit{Hecke components}, \quad i = 1, \dots, r_p^+,\\
&C_i \equiv c_i^p \ \mathit{mod}\ \pi^p, \quad i = 1, \dots, r_p^+.
\end{aligned}$$

Proof. Let $x^p + y^p + z^p = 0$ with $z \equiv 0 \mod p, \quad xy \not\equiv 0 \mod p$. We have proved in theorem 19.2 p. 198 that $z \equiv 0 \mod p^2$. From Ribenboim [39] (3B).2 p 58, $x + y + z \equiv 0 \mod p^2$, and so $x + y \equiv 0 \mod p^2$. Therefore

$$\frac{x + \zeta y}{1 - \zeta} \equiv x \bmod p^2.$$

By conjugation, we get

$$\frac{x + \zeta^{-1} y}{1 - \zeta^{-1}} \equiv x \bmod p^2.$$

From these two relations we get

$$\frac{\frac{x+\zeta y}{1-\zeta}}{\frac{x+\zeta^{-1}y}{1-\zeta^{-1}}} \equiv 1 \bmod p^2.$$

From factorization of ideals in Dedekind ring $\mathbb{Z}[\zeta]$ we get

$$\frac{x + \zeta y}{1 - \zeta}\mathbb{Z}[\zeta] = \mathbf{s}^p,$$

where $\mathbf{s}$ is an integral ideal of $\mathbb{Z}[\zeta]$. Let us consider the relative class group C_p^-. Let $C_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, r_p^-$, defined in lemma 2.9 p. 28. Strictly similarly to relation obtained in FLT first case, we can write in the second case,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{\frac{x+\zeta y}{1-\zeta}}{\frac{x+\zeta^{-1}y}{1-\zeta^{-1}}} = \zeta^v \times C_1^{\nu_1} \times \dots \times C_{r_p^-}^{\nu_{r_p^-}} \times \gamma_1^p, \\
&\gamma_1 \in \mathbb{Q}(\zeta), \quad C_i \equiv 1 \bmod \pi^{2m_i+1}, \quad 1 \le m_i \le \frac{p-3}{2}, \quad i = 1, \dots, r_p^- \\
&v \in \mathbb{N}, \quad \nu_i \in \mathbb{N}, \quad i = 1, \dots, r_p^-,
\end{aligned}$$

where $C_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, r_p^+$, are singular primary and $C_i, \quad i = r_p^+ + 1, \dots, r_p^-$, are not singular primary (see Hilbert class field structure theorem 4.3 p. 56). These relations imply that $v \equiv 0 \mod p$. The number $(\frac{x+\zeta y}{1-\zeta})/(\frac{x+\zeta^{-1}y}{1-\zeta^{-1}})$ is singular primary, so from theorem 4.4 p. 56, application of class field theory, we get $\nu_{r_p^+ + 1} \equiv \dots \equiv \nu_{r_p^-} \equiv 0 \mod p$ and finally we get

$$(\frac{x + \zeta y}{1 - \zeta})/(\frac{x + \zeta^{-1} y}{1 - \zeta^{-1}}) = C_1^{\nu_1} \times \dots \times C_{r_p^+}^{\nu_{r_p^+}} \times \gamma_2^p, \quad \gamma_2 \in \mathbb{Q}(\zeta).$$

□

Corollary 19.5. *Suppose that* $h^+ \not\equiv 0$ *mod* p. *Suppose that* $x^p + y^p + z^p = 0$ *with* $z \equiv 0$ *mod* p, $\quad xy \not\equiv 0$ *mod* p. *Then* x, y *verify the relation*

$$\begin{aligned}
&x + y \equiv 0 \ mod\ p^2,\\
&\frac{\frac{x+\zeta y}{1-\zeta}}{\frac{x+\zeta^{-1}y}{1-\zeta^{-1}}} = (\frac{\gamma_1}{\overline{\gamma}_1})^p, \quad \gamma_1 \in \mathbb{Z}(\zeta),\\
&\frac{x+\zeta y}{1-\zeta} = \eta \times \gamma_1^p,\\
&\eta \equiv d^p \ mod\ \pi^p, \quad d \in \mathbb{Z}.
\end{aligned}$$

Proof. Apply theorem 19.4 p. 202 with the relation deduced of $h^+ \not\equiv 0$ mod p:

$$\begin{aligned}
&(\frac{x+\zeta y}{1-\zeta}) \times (\frac{x+\zeta^{-1}y}{1-\zeta^{-1}}) = \eta^2 \times \gamma_1^p \times \overline{\gamma}_1^p,\\
&\eta \in \mathbb{Z}[\zeta + \zeta^{-1}]^*,
\end{aligned}$$

to get

$$\frac{x+\zeta y}{1-\zeta} = \eta \times \gamma_1^p, \quad \eta \in \mathbb{Z}[\zeta + \zeta^{-1}]^*.$$

From $\frac{x+\zeta y}{1-\zeta} \equiv 1$ mod p^2 we derive that $\eta \equiv d^p$ mod π^p, $\quad d \in \mathbb{Z}$, $\quad d \not\equiv 0$ mod p. ☐

Remark: observe that this corollary is consistent with Washington formulation [68] in page 171 and with theorem 19.3 p. 201 of this monograph. The next result is an independant application of several results given in Washington,[68]: the validation of this theorem implies to follow the proof with the Washington book. The notations are those of Washington.

Theorem 19.6. *Let* I *be the set of irregular indices. Let* E_{2i}, $\quad i = 1, \dots, \frac{p-3}{2}$, *be the units defined in Washington [68] p 155. If* $h^+ \not\equiv 0$ *mod* p *then*

$$\frac{x+\zeta y}{1-\zeta} = (\prod_{i \in I} E_{2i}^{\alpha_{j_i}}) \times \gamma_2^p, \quad \gamma_2 \in \mathbb{Z}[\zeta].$$

Proof. Suppose that $x^p + y^p + z^p = 0$, $\quad z \equiv 0$ mod p, $\quad xy \not\equiv 0$ mod p. We start of the relation

$$\frac{x+\zeta y}{1-\zeta} = \eta \times \gamma^p, \quad \eta \in \mathbb{Z}[\zeta + \zeta^{-1}]^*, \quad \gamma \in \mathbb{Z}[\zeta + \zeta^{-1}].$$

Let us consider the E_{2i}, $\quad i = 1, \dots, \frac{p-1}{2}$, defined in relation 55 p. 54 and also in Washington [68] p. 155:

$$\begin{aligned}
&E_{2i} = \prod_{a=1}^{p-1} (\zeta^{(1-u)/2} \frac{1-\zeta^{au}}{1-\zeta^a})^{a^{2i}\tau_a^{-1}},\\
&\tau_a(\zeta) = \zeta^a, \quad a = 1, \dots, p-1.
\end{aligned}$$

From Washington [68], corollary 8.15 p 156, the $E_{2i}, \quad i = 1, \dots, \frac{p-3}{2}$, generate the group $\mathbb{Z}[\zeta+\zeta^{-1}]^*/(\mathbb{Z}[\zeta+\zeta^{-1}]^*)^p$. Therefore we can write from corollary 19.5 p. 204

$$\frac{x+\zeta y}{1-\zeta} = (\prod_{i=1}^{(p-3)/2} E_{2i}^{\alpha_i}) \times \gamma_1^p.$$

Let $B_{2i}, \quad i = 1, \dots, \frac{p-3}{2}$, be the even Bernoulli Numbers. Let ρ be the index of iregularity of p. Let $i_j, \quad i = 1, \dots, \rho$, be the irregular indices, so of the $B_{2i} \equiv 0 \bmod p$. From Washington [68] exercise 8.9 p 165, the extension $H/\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$ defined by

$$H = \mathbb{Q}(\zeta, E_{2i_1}^{1/p}, \dots, E_{2i_\rho}^{1/p})/\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$$

is unramified. Therefore, the extensions $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta, E_{2i_j}^{1/p})/\mathbb{Q}(\zeta), \quad i = 1, \dots, \rho$, are unramified and so $E_{2i_j}, \quad j = 1, \dots, \rho$, are primary units and so

$$E_{i_j} \equiv c_{i_j}^p \bmod \pi^p, \quad c_{i_j} \in \mathbb{N}, \quad j = 1, \dots, \rho.$$

Let $I = \{i_1, \dots i_\rho\}$ be the set of irregular indices. Let $J = \{i \mid i = 1, \dots, \frac{p-3}{2}, \quad i \notin I\}$. We deduce that

$$\frac{x+\zeta y}{1-\zeta} \equiv c_1 \times \prod_{i\in J} E_{2i}^{\alpha_i} \bmod \pi^p, \quad c_1 \in \mathbb{Z}, \quad c_1 \not\equiv 0 \bmod p.$$

We have seen in theorem 19.2 p. 198 that $x + y \equiv 0 \bmod p^2$, so

$$\prod_{i\in J} E_{2i}^{\alpha_i} \equiv c_2 \bmod \pi^p, \quad c_2 \in \mathbb{Z}, \quad c_2 \not\equiv 0 \bmod p.$$

Let $\beta = (\zeta - 1)(\zeta^{-1} - 1)$. From Washington [68], exercise 8.11 p 166, we get

$$\begin{aligned} &E_{2i} \equiv a_i + b_i \times \beta^i \bmod \pi^{2(i+1)}, \quad i \in J, \\ &a_i \in \mathbb{Z}, \quad b_i \in \mathbb{Z}, \quad a_i \not\equiv 0 \bmod p, \quad b_i \not\equiv 0 \bmod p. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore

$$\prod_{i\in J} (a_i + b_i \times \beta^i)^{\alpha_i} \equiv c_2 \bmod \pi^p, \quad c_2 \in \mathbb{Z}, \quad c_2 \not\equiv 0 \bmod p.$$

Suppose that there exists a smallest i_1 with $i \in J$ and with $\alpha_{i_1} \not\equiv 0 \bmod p$. We deduce that

$$(a_{i_1} + \beta^i \times b_{i_1})^{\alpha_{i_1}} \equiv c \bmod \pi^{2(i_1+1)}$$

and so

$$(a_{i_1} + \alpha_{i_1} \times \beta^i \times b_{i_1}) \equiv c \bmod \pi^{2(i_1+1)}$$

which implies that $\alpha_{i_1} \equiv 0 \bmod p$, contradiction. Therefore $\alpha_i \equiv 0 \bmod p$ for $i \in J$ and finally

$$\frac{x + \zeta y}{1 - \zeta} = (\prod_{i \in I} E_{2i}^{\alpha_{j_i}}) \times \gamma_2^p, \quad \gamma_2 \in \mathbb{Z}[\zeta].$$

□

Remark: This formulation is consistent with structure theorem on Hilbert-class field of $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$ 4.3 p. 56. Here $r_p^+ = 0$.

Acknowledgements I would like to thank Professors Guy Terjanian in Toulouse and Bruno Anglès in Caen, Yves Hellegouarch in Caen, Antoine Chambert-Loir in Paris, Vincent Fleckinger in Besanon, Franz Lemmermeyer in Heidelberg and San Marcos, Gerhard Niklasch in Munchen and Preda Mihailescu in Paderborn Germany, to give me helpful advice during the writing of this article and to point out to me a very large number of errors in previous versions, and also to Professor Ladislav Skula of Mazaryk University, Brno, Czech Republic for advice and help on Mirimanoff and Kummer congruences bibliography.

References

[1] B. Anglès, *Units and norm residue symbols*, Acta Arithm., XCVIII.1, 2001, 33-51.

[2] Z.I. Borevitch and I.R. Chafarevitch, *Théorie des Nombres*, Gauthiers-Villars, 1967.

[3] J. Calais, *Eléments de Théorie des Groupes*, Presses Universitaires de France, 1984.

[4] A. Cauchy, *Mémoire sur diverses propositions relatives à la Théorie des Nombres*, C.R. Acad Sci. Paris, 1847, pp. 177-183.

[5] P. Cilánek, *A special extension of Wieferich's criterion*, Math. Comp., no 62, 1994, pp 923–930.

[6] P. Dénes, *Uber irregulare Kreiskorper*, Publ. Math. Debrecen, 3, 1954, pp. 17-23.

[7] P. Dénes, *Uber Grundeinheitssysteme der irregularen Kreiskorper von besonderen Kongruenzeigenschaften*, Publ. Math. Debrecen, 1954, pp. 195-204.

[8] P. Dénes, *Uber den zweiten Faktor der Klassenzahl und den Irregularitatsgrad der irregularen Kreiskorper*, Publ. Math. Debrecen, 4, 1956, pp. 163-170.

[9] K. Dilcher and L. Skula, *A new criterium for the first case of Fermat's Last Theorem,* Math. Comp., no 64, 1995, pp. 363-392.

[10] M. Eichler, *Eine Bemerkung zur Fermatschen Vermutung.*, Acta. Arith., no 11, 1965, pp. 129-131,261.

[11] S. Finch, *On a Generalized Fermat-Wiles Equation* http://www.mathsoft/asolve/fermat/fermat.html, 1999.

[12] R. Fueter, *Kummer's Kriterien zum letzten Theorem von Fermat*, Math. Annalen, 85, 1922, 11-20.

[13] P. Furtwangler, *Allgemeiner Existenzbeweis fur den Klassenkorper eines beliebigen algebraischen Zallkorpers*, Math Annalen, 63, 1907, 1-37.

[14] I. Gozard, *Théorie de Galois*, Ellipses, 1997.

[15] F.G. Gouvea, *p-adic Numbers, An introduction*, Springer, 1997.

[16] A. Granville and M.B. Monagan, *The first case of Fermat's Last Theorem is true for all prime exponents up to 714,591,416,091,389* Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., no 306, 1988, pp 329–359.

[17] E. Hecke, *Uber nicht-regulare Primzahlen und der Fermatschen Satz*, Nachr Akad. d. Wiss. Gottingen, 1910, 429-434.

[18] J. Herbrand, *Sur les classes des corps circulaires, J. Math. Pures Appl.* (9), no 11,1932,pp. 417-441.

[19] K. Inkeri, *Some extensions of criteria concerning singular primary integers in cyclotomic fields*, Annales Acad. Sci. Fennicae, Ser. A. I. 1948, No 49, 15 pages.

[20] K. Ireland and M. Rosen, *A classical Introduction to Modern Number Theory*,Springer-Verlag, 1982.

[21] G. James and M. Liebeck, *Representations and Characters of Groups*, Cambridge University Press, 1993.

[22] H. Koch, *Algebraic Number Theory*, Springer, 1997.

[23] V. Kolyvagin, *Euler systems*, The Grothendieck Festschrift, Vol II, 1990, pp 435-483.

[24] M. Krasner, *Sur le premier cas du théorème de Fermat*, C.R. Acad. Sci. Paris, no 199, 1934, pp 256-258.

[25] E.E. Kummer, *Uber die Erganzungssatze zu der allgemeinen Reciprotatsgesetzen*, J. reine u. angew. Math., no 53, 1857, pp. 142-148.

[26] S. Lang, *Algebra*, Addisoon-Wesley, 1978.

[27] S. Lang, *Cyclotomic Fields*, Springer-Verlag, 1978.

[28] S. Lang, *Algebraic Number Theory*, Addison-Wesley, 1970.

[29] D.H. Lehmer, *Prime Factors of Cyclotomic Class Numbers*, Math. Comp., vol 31, no 138, 1977, pp. 599-607.

[30] P. Lelidec, *Sur une forme nouvelle des congruences de Kummer-Mirimanoff*, C.R. Acad. Sci. Paris, no 265, 1967, pp 89-90.

[31] D.A. Marcus, *Numbers Field*, Springer-Verlag, 1977.

[32] J.M. Masley, *On the first factor of the class number of prime cyclotomic fields*, J. Number Theory, 10, 1978, pp. 273-290.

[33] D. Mirimanoff, *L'équation indéterminée* $x^l + y^l + z^l = 0$ *et le critérium de Kummer.*, J. reine u. angew. Math., no 128, 1905, pp. 45-68.

[34] D. Mirimanoff, *Sur le dernier Théorème de Fermat et le criterium de M.A. Wieferich*, Enseignement Math., no 11, 1909, pp 455-459.

[35] P. Morandi, *Field and Galois Theory*, Springer, 1996.

[36] T. Morishima, *Uber den Fermatschen Quotienten*, Jpn. J. Math., no 8, 1931, pp 159-173.

[37] C. Mutafian, *équations algébriques et théorie de Galois*, Vuibert, 1980.

[38] W. Narkiewicz, *Elementary and Analytic Theory of Algebraic Numbers*, Springer Verlag and Polish Scientific Publishers, 1990.

[39] P. Ribenboim, *13 Lectures on Fermat's Last Theorem*, Springer-Verlag, 1979.

[40] P. Ribenboim, *Epilogue to 13 Lectures on Fermat's Last Theorem*, Springer-Verlag, 1995, pp 291-297.

[41] P. Ribenboim, *L'arithmétique des corps*, Hermann, 1972.

[42] P. Ribenboim, *Fermat's Last Theorem For Amateurs*, Springer, 1999.

[43] P. Ribenboim, *Classical Theory of Algebraic Numbers*, Springer, 2001.

[44] K. Ribet, *A modular construction of unramified* $p-$*extensions of* $\mathbb{Q}(\mu_p)$*.*, Invent.Math. no 34, 1976, pp. 151-162.

[45] H. Schwindt, *Eine Bemerkung zu einem Kriterium von H.S. Vandiver*, Jahresber. d. Deutschen Math. Verein, no 43, 1933, pp 229-232.

[46] P. Samuel, *Théorie Algébrique des Nombres*, Hermann, 1971.

[47] J.P. Serre, *Représentation linéaire des groupes finis*, Hermann, 1978.

[48] S. Sitaraman, *Vandiver revisited*, J. Number Theory, no 57, 1996, pp 122-129.

[49] L. Skula, *Non possibility to prove infinity of regular primes from some theorems*,J. Reine Angew. Math., no 291, 1977, pp 162-181.

[50] L. Skula, *A remark on Mirimanoff polynomials*, Commentarii Math. Univ. Sancti Pauli(Tokyo), no 31, 1982, pp 89 97.

[51] L. Skula, *On the Kummer's System of congruences*, Commentarii Math. Univ. Sancti Pauli(Tokyo), no 35, 1986, pp 137–163.

[52] L. Skula, *Some consequences of the Kummer system of congruences*, Commentarii Math. Univ. Sancti Pauli(Tokyo), no 39, 1990, pp 19–40.

[53] L. Skula, *Fermat's Last Theorem and the Fermat quotients*, Commentarii Math.Univ. Sancti Pauli(Tokyo), no 41, 1992, pp 35-54.

[54] L. Skula, *the orders of solutions of the Kummer system of congruences*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., n 0 343(2), 1994, pp 587-607.

[55] L. Skula, *The Kummer system of congruences and index of irregularity, Uter.-Ung.-Slov.Koll. uber Zahlentheorie, Graz, 1992*, Grazer Math. Bericht, no 318, 1993, pp 169-172.

[56] Susuki, *On the generalized Wieferich criteria*, Proc. Japan Acad. Ser. A70, no 7, 1994, pp 230-234.

[57] L. Stickelberger *Uber eine Verallgemeinerung der Kreistheilung*, Math. Annal., 37 , 1890, pp 321-367.

[58] G. Terjanian, *Sur la loi de réciprocité des puissances l-èmes*, Acta Arithmetica LVI, 1989, pp 87-125.

[59] F. Thaine, *On the first case of Fermat's Last Theorem*, J. Number Theory, no 20, 1985, pp 128-142.

[60] F. Thaine, *On Fermat's Last Theorem and the arithmetic of* $\mathbb{Z}[\zeta+\zeta^{-1}]$, J. Number Theory, no 29, 1988, pp 297-299.

[61] H.S. Vandiver, *Extension of the criteria of Wieferich and Mirimanoff in connection with Fermat's Last Theorem* , J. Reine Angew. Math., no 144, 1914, pp 314-318.

[62] H.S. Vandiver, *A new type of criteria for the first case of Fermat's Last Theorem*, Annals of Math., no 26, 1925, pp 88-94.

[63] H.S. Vandiver, *Some theorems concerning properly irregular cyclotomic fields*, Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. U.S.A., no 15,1929, pp 202-207.

[64] H.S. Vandiver, *A theorem of Kummer's concerning the second factor of the class number of a cyclotomic field.* Bull. Amer. Math. Soc., no 35, 1929, pp 333-335.

[65] H.S. Vandiver, *On the second factor of the class number of a cyclotomic field.* Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. U.S.A., no 16, 1930, pp 139-150.

[66] H.S. Vandiver, *On Bernoulli Numbers and Fermat's Last Theorem*, Duke Math. J., no 3, 1937, pp 569-584.

[67] H.S. Vandiver, *A property of cyclotomic integers and its relation to Fermat's Last Theorem*, Annals of Math., no 21, 1919, pp 73-80.

[68] L.C. Washington, *Introduction to cyclotomic fields*, Springer, 1996.

[69] A. Wieferich, *Zum letzten Fermat'schen Theorem*, J. reine u.angew. Math., no 136, 1909, pp 293-302.

[70] K. Yamada, *Berichtigung zu der Note:Eine Bemerkung zum Fermatschen Problem.*,Tôhoku Math. J., no 48, 1941, pp 193-198.

[71] O. Zariski, P. Samuel, *Commutative Algebra*, Springer-Verlag, 1975.

[72] R. Zimmert, *Ideale kleiner Norm in Idealklassen und eine Regulatorabschatzung.*, Invent. Math., no 62,1981, pp. 367-380.

Roland Quême
13 avenue du château d'eau
31490 Brax
France
2002 october 31
mailto: roland.queme@free.fr
home page: http://roland.queme.free.fr/index.html